

2

C. C.

EVIDENCE

OF MORE

ROMAN CATHOLIC INJUSTICE;

BEING

A Defence of the Narrative

OF

RAFFAELE CIOCCI,

AGAINST

THE MISREPRESENTATIONS CONTAINED IN AN
ARTICLE IN THE "DUBLIN REVIEW."

BY

RAFFAELE CIOCCI,

FORMERLY A BENEDICTINE AND CISTERCIAN MONK,
STUDENT AND HON. LIBRARIAN OF THE PAPAL COLLEGE OF SAN BER-
NARDO, ALLE TERME DICCESIANE, IN ROME.

LONDON:

JAMES NISBET & CO., BERNERS STREET.

CURRY, JUN., AND CO.; AND ROBERTSON AND CO., DUBLIN;

KENNEDY, EDINBURGH; AND BRYCE, GLASGOW.

1845.

MACINTOSH, PRINTER,
GREAT NEW-STREET, LONDON

PREFACE.

THE Narrative to which the following pages relate was written with a view to advance the interests of truth, by describing the injustice and cruelties which are practised in Rome under the influence of superstition. Since the time when that little work was published, it has become necessary to vindicate its statements against a violent attack in the "Dublin Review." The writer might have sufficient personal motives to raise him above indifference to that attack, and to impel him to reply to it. But the respect which was due to many friends has added something to those personal feelings which would make an individual aim at vindicating himself from the charge of falsehood and imposture. And it is hoped that the following reply will be found to be both temperate and just; and to contain suitable answers to all those charges by which false representations were attributed to the

author. And as it has been written under the distinct recognition of the sacredness of truth, and with the desire that truth may advance with an accelerated speed, until all men shall feel its force and own its sway; so it is hoped that this humble effort may contribute something to the attainment of that great end.

Many papers which would have supplied irrefragable proof to the statements in the Narrative, were left in a trunk at San Bernardo; and D. Girolamo Bottini, Procurator-General of the Cistercian order, has refused to let them be sent, if the writer's "communion with the Holy Chair were not evident."

FURNIVAL'S INN,

June 14, 1845.

EVIDENCE

OF

ROMAN CATHOLIC INJUSTICE.

SEVERAL months ago I published a small work under the title of "A Narrative of Iniquities and Barbarities practised at Rome in the Nineteenth Century." After the second edition of it had appeared, it was reviewed in the "Dublin Review;" and the "Tablet" newspaper of the 2d of November, 1844, acknowledges the article to have been the contribution of Dr. Wiseman. The aim of Dr. Wiseman is to throw discredit upon the whole Narrative; and with this view he has assumed that the city of Rome is little more favourable to transactions, such as are described, than the city of London. But although Rome is not the mysterious place which he has amused his readers by describing, yet there is in the government and institutions of that city much that may satisfy the English reader of the credibility of the Narrative.

The reputation of some of the persons implicated in the transactions described in the

Narrative is again appealed to for the purpose of raising the improbability almost to an impossibility that it should be true. But with respect to these it may be remarked, that the characters of men are often not accurately or sufficiently known until they are placed in those trying situations which either develop their virtues in full beauty and vigour, or show that the principles from which moral excellence springs had never entered sufficiently into the constitution of their character. And then Dr. Wiseman affirms that the Narrative is "full of contradictions," and that on every point on which he had had it in his power to put its assertions to the test, he had found them untrue, and its statements positively false.

Dr. Wiseman further endeavours to destroy all confidence in my veracity, by imputing to me the basest ingratitude towards those who had been my kindest friends in England, namely, the Rev. John Blackburn, Rector of Attercliffe, Sheffield; the Rev. James James, Rector of Pinol, Exeter*; and the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Wriothesley Noel. And to this end he attributes to me these words, "Ah! these scoundrels wish to induce me to write, that so they may publish some horrible book against our holy religion. Never will I do this, as I would rather die than utter a word against it." If this state-

* These are the two gentlemen to whom I referred, p. 148 of the Narrative.

ment had been true, it would have been sufficient to invalidate whatever claims to veracity I may assert in behalf of my Narrative. But as no such sentiments were ever uttered by me, it may be proper here to give an absolute denial of them, since I have no doubt that they are the invention of a priest who visited me at the hotel at which I was staying in London, and used his utmost efforts to induce a return to the Roman Catholic profession.

Perhaps this may be the most suitable place to introduce what it is necessary to say, relating to the first interview which took place between myself and Dr. Baldacconi. This, it has been asserted in the Narrative (p. 177), was by "a call from Dr. Baldacconi." "Now," Dr. Wiseman says (p. 286), "so far from this being the case, Ciocchi was the first to call on that Rev. Gentleman, and, with tears in his eyes, made himself known as 'an apostate,' and promised to return to Rome. Every conversation which he relates as held with that gentleman, he is prepared to assert is most false. Mr. C. pretends that he was quite a Protestant before he quitted Rome: why, then, did he go to mass at the Sardinian Chapel, on the 29th of June of that year, the feast of the holy Apostles, Saints Peter and Paul; and even go into the vestry and speak with the priest there?"

If Dr. Baldacconi has asserted all that

appears here, he must have presumed on the very easy credulity of those to whom he made his statements; as the improbability of truth which appears in them, when placed in juxtaposition with undoubted facts, must amount to almost a moral impossibility. Here is a young man, having recently escaped from a monastery in Rome, and found refuge on the hospitable shores of England, represented as introducing himself to the priest officiating at the chapel of the Sardinian Ambassador, confessing, in tears, his apostasy, and desiring to be sent back to Rome, rather than go to the Catholic Bishop, who would have been the proper person to treat with on such an affair. But why bewail his apostasy, and yet reject every overture that was made to him to be restored? What claim has the tale to be believed? Wherefore, that the reader may not have to perplex himself with premises and inferences, which do not always establish or disprove a fact, he is plainly told that Dr. Baldacconi was the first to seek an interview, which was at Wood's Hotel, Furnival's-inn; and that he introduced himself, not as a Catholic priest, but as a gentleman sustaining quite a different position in society. Nor did he allow his profession to be known until he repeated his call at the same place. To the fact that he made the *first* call there are seven credible witnesses, who are willing to give their testimony.

After having received *two* visits from Dr. Baldacconi, I made my *first* call at that gentleman's house on the 29th of June, 1842, and was shown into the drawing-room to wait. At that time I was wholly unacquainted with the English language, and could not understand the servant by whom I was admitted, and of whom I inquired for Dr. Baldacconi. After waiting some time, and having no means of making my inquiries intelligible, I was going away, when I was met by the servant, who, understanding merely that I wished to see her master, pointed down a staircase, which, on descending, it was found led to the door of the vestry. I entered, and saw Dr. Baldacconi, in company with a gentleman, a priest, who had been at mass. I then returned with Dr. Baldacconi into his house. And this is what Dr. Wiseman calls "*going to mass!*" The gentleman who was present at the interview in the vestry, and who afterwards went into the priest's house, is now in England, and is willing to give his testimony to this fact, if it be necessary.

Dr. Baldacconi is a man of strong feeling; and the reader may understand that he was greatly provoked at having failed in all his attempts to prevail on me to enter some Roman Catholic establishment. This vexation was aggravated by the fact of his having written to Cardinal Acton, at Rome,

that arrangements had been made for this purpose. That any concession should have been made to the proposals of Dr. Baldacconi on this subject, may require an explanation. It is this:—Having expressed a wish to study the English and German languages, Dr. Baldacconi recommended to me Oscott College as a suitable place for pursuing those studies, without saying that it was a Roman Catholic institution. But when this fact became known, as happily it did before setting out for that place, no other motive was required to form, without the most transient pause, the determination not to go thither. But such a resolution would be unaccountable had there been any wish to return to Rome. And this fact, viewed in connexion with Dr. Baldacconi's statement of such a wish, is sufficient to place that gentleman's veracity in a most questionable point of view.

It may be proper to add a few observations respecting the persevering obtrusiveness of the Catholic emissaries on me shortly after my arrival in London. Now, knowing that in the Catholic Church, especially in countries far from Rome, the Ministry is exercised by the most widely-diffused orders, which are the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Jesuits ; and as these persons assumed the appearance of missionaries, with the monastic peculiarities in conversation and manner, without the *habit* of any order to indicate

what they really were, it was inferred that they were monks. I am willing, however, to allow that I may have drawn a wrong inference from these appearances. For Dr. Wiseman says (p. 286) there was not a single Dominican or Franciscan at that time in London. But he dares not say there were no Jesuits here ; for I know well where plenty of these may be found in London. And the members of this order are animated by the same spirit as those of the other orders, and prosecute the same objects. This objection has, then, more the appearance of captiousness than of anything else.

The first part of the Narrative, of which the truth is directly assailed, is the statement of the military diversion in which the students at the schools of the Sapienza engaged on the holidays, when they were allowed to choose their own recreations. There is nothing apparently incredible in the choice which they made of amusement. It was customary for the students at the different schools to hold their meetings of recreation without the walls of the city ; as there were places convenient for their purpose. Generally, however, their games were carried on under the eye of a monk or priest, who had charge of the students. But, as it was customary for the students to assemble in those places for amusement, and as these youths were not *residents* of a college, they deemed themselves free to select their mode

of pastime in their leisure hours, as they were not apprehensive that the carabiniers would interfere with them. This supposition was verified, although their amusements were quite public. But there was a just suspicion, that if the monks or priests should become aware of their proceedings, the continuance of them would be prohibited. Of the 300 students (or thereabouts) who were associated in these mock-military exercises, seldom more than 200 attended at the same time ; various other objects, if not indisposition, interfering with their regular attention to this sport. The period from the commencement to the dissolution of this association was about three months. Their harmless weapons were deposited at a house without the city walls, occupied by the parents of one of the students, the Chevalier Sarazani. And, although the amusement had been indulged without restraint, and was open to the observation of any who might pass by the roads near them, yet the entrance of a large number of students into the city at one time, unaccompanied by a master, might have led to inquiry, not from the magistrates, but from the ecclesiastical authorities, and the association would be broken up. On this account they entered the city in small companies. This precaution did not evidently interfere with the publicity of the amusement which had preceded it. And, it may be presumed, that this explanation is

sufficient to show that there is not in this part of the Narrative the discrepancy which Dr. Wiseman supposed he had detected. And the allusion to Falstaff and his encounter with the men "in buckram suits" is, then, quite irrelevant.

When these amusements at length became the object of ecclesiastical interference, it is evident that a more summary way might have been taken to put an end to them. But when a certain course has been chosen, and the business disposed of accordingly, there is an end of reasoning upon the various other means by which the same result might have been realized. It argues nothing in the matter, that Dr. Wiseman's plan of putting down such a diversion might have been the most rational, and the most likely to be acted upon in England, or perhaps, in other circumstances, in Rome. But if there was a semblance of military organization to any extent, as to both numbers and respectability, within so short a time after the disturbance in the Papal States, it appears to have been the result of discreet policy to dispose of the ringleaders in such a way that they should no more have it in their power to form combinations which might be subversive of the political or ecclesiastical order under which they lived. The separation and disposal of them in the manner stated in the Narrative must have that effect. The recommendation of the Jesuits was sufficient

to obtain a situation as clerk in a bank—nothing very great, and therefore not very marvellous—for one of them. But the obtaining of a commission in the line for a son of Prince Ghigi is disputed, on the rather bold assumption, that *what is not now, necessarily was not some eight years ago*, when the appointment was procured. This want of evidence to support the charge of false statement is sufficiently palpable to indicate with what slender support confident assertion may be made; and, therefore, the degree of confidence, of which those statements are worthy, which have no other evidence to sustain them than the *opinion* of Dr. Wiseman.

As to Giovanni Lalli, the remarks of Dr. Wiseman apply to a case quite different from that which the author had stated. Nothing is intimated in the Narrative that he was made “*a judge*,” but it is affirmed that he was appointed to the post of “Under-Chancellor” at Pignano, a market-town of little importance. Not only is the situation to which he was appointed not that of a “judge,” but it is below that of the chancellor, whose duty it is to record the transactions of the magistrate. Hence Giovanni Lalli’s office was that of a *subordinate clerk*, rather than of a “judge,” a dignity to which he was elevated only by the very powerful imagination of Dr. Wiseman. The term “*la laurea*,” properly applied to his case, had no such mean-

ing as “the degree of a doctor.” It meant simply the ordinary degree to which he was entitled on having passed through the usual course of studies at the University. This part of the article renders Dr. Wiseman’s acquaintance with the details of the usages at that Institution very doubtful; and places his integrity and veracity in a still worse light.

With regard to the disposal of myself, Dr. Wiseman sarcastically remarks, “Surely the Jesuits tried to secure him to their own schools. Oh, no; they determined that he should be a Cistercian monk.” Now, what does this amount to? only to this, that my aversion to enter a college, rendered me ineligible to one belonging to the Jesuits, who admit to their community no members against their will; whilst such a disposition is by no means an insurmountable difficulty to admission into the Cistercian order, into which youths are received who are sent by the imperative determination of their parents, as well as those whose own inclination leads them to abjure domestic life.

Dr. Wiseman proceeds to that part of the Narrative which describes my admission as a novice into the Cistercian monastery; and my introduction to the ten youths who had preceded me in the novitiate. These are described into the Narrative as having “pallid countenances, sunken eyes, and attenuated

forms," so different from what had been formerly theirs. The cause of this altered appearance in the youths is left untold in the Narrative; but Dr. Wiseman says, "it is intimated that the whole had been kidnapped, and imprisoned there against their wills." Now it *is not so intimated in the Narrative*; but it is expressly stated (p. 35) that "all my companions with the exception of D. Cherubino had voluntarily given themselves to the sacrifice:" that is, the ten who were first seen there, and twelve out of the thirteen, who were admitted into the novitiate during the following fortnight.* The cause of the unhappy and unhealthy appearance was, in all probability, the self-denial and penance which they were required to endure.

It is not in the monastery of the Cistercian monks of San Bernardo alone that the youths exhibit this piteous appearance. The fact has other public testimony than that which I have addressed to the English. It engages the interest, and excites the commiseration, of both the French and the Germans. The following passage, quoted in a recent number of the "*Archives du Christianisme au Dix-neuvième Siècle*," a French periodical, bears witness to a similar condition of the students

* It is not necessary to notice further the observation of Dr. Wiseman (pp. 271—2), that "some way or other, the number increases to four-and-twenty."

at the University in which the writer had pursued his studies:—

"From the time of my admission to the seminary, I could read in the countenances of my companions, according to the differences of their characters,—consternation, anguish, sorrow, or hopeless resignation. The first night neither of the five pupils who slept in the same chamber with me, uttered a single syllable; shut up in himself, each endeavoured to obtain repose in silence. Forty young people in the flower of youth, crept into the shade like mummies; and, without speaking, we looked into each other's countenance to perceive what was going on in his heart. The most humble endeavoured to raise himself to that species of heroism which sacrifices in one day the bright prospects of his youth, his desires, his hopes, and his liberty; and, under this impression, the heart of the young man of twenty-four years, which beats with so much joy, and confidence, and warmth, was subdued; and the self-esteem instilled into him at pleasure, pours into his arteries the poison of distrust and envy. The despotism of the Roman hierarchy presented itself to me like a spectre which filled me with horror, a spectre whom I saw occupied in digging graves in which every lively young man should be buried, and which should at last swallow up the liberty and happiness of the people. Submission, a blind

and absurd submission,—such is the first law of Rome.”

This passage needs but little passing observation, as of itself it shows the effect of collegiate discipline on youthful minds, and declares the tendency of monastic institutions. The increasing respect which is paid to the principles of civil and religious liberty, requires and obtains the disclosure of mysteries which contribute much to the support of those institutions which are essentially adverse to the influence of these principles on society at large. For the vigilance, and discipline, and influence of the Catholic hierarchy, are not sufficient to restrain the expression, or to suppress the belief in those statements where intelligence has a free and wholesome circulation.

It is now necessary to examine that part of the article which relates to the intercourse of the novices with their parents and friends. And here it may be repeated that personal intercourse is prohibited during the novitiate. A novice is enjoined neither to speak to a friend whom he may meet in the street, nor to raise his eyes from the ground to look at him.*

* “Without permission of the master, the novices are not to speak to any one, not even to relations; they are neither to receive nor to send letters, nor to take goods or presents, not even from relations, without express permission of the master himself; nor ever to go out of the novitiate (the apartments appropriated to the

As, then, the private visits of parents are not allowed during the novitiate, all the correspondence that could be kept up would be by letters. But the regulations of the establishment forbid any letters to be sent without their being subject to the perusal of the masters.* Nor have the novices, nor has it been “*taught*” that they have, as Dr. Wiseman affirms, the facility of corrupting servants for the purpose of conveying letters. The novices are attended by servants who are wholly at the command of the monks, to whom it is believed they are generally faithful. All intercourse with the novices is guarded with the strictest care, so that it is almost *impossible* for any private communication to pass between them and their friends. The extreme caution

use of the novices), unless accompanied by the same master.”—Constitutions of the Monks, cap. xv. 82. “The master shall especially take care of this, that no stranger, whoever he may be, not even a parent, shall speak to the novices without his permission. But even when the permission has been sought and obtained, he shall by no means permit him to address him, except he himself, or the deputy master (socius), shall be present and listening.”—Constitutiones Urbanæ, in Capitulo 11 Regulæ S. Bened.

* “It is altogether forbidden either to write or to receive letters without the permission of the master, by whom this is not to be granted without sufficient cause. And everything that is written, either by himself or by his companion (correspondent), must be always seen.”—Regulæ S. Bened. Paragraph xvi.

by which access to them has been guarded, will be further seen by the following passage.

“There shall be no access to the house of the novices for any of the regulars, not even for the officials of the convent, at any time, under any pretext whatever. The key which locks up this place shall be always kept by the master, and he alone shall have the power of permitting any one to enter. And if any one shall wish to speak to one of the novices, he may do so in the master’s presence, and not otherwise.”—*Constitutio Sexti V. De Domibus Novitiorum, Confirmata à Clemente VIII.*

But Dr. Wiseman’s remarks on the most extraordinary part of this question, betray, as it appears, an entire want of acquaintance with the matter which he endeavours to make appear impracticable,—the falsification of the letters on both sides. Now the imitation of handwriting is not only very possible, but easy, by the practice of an art which was invented in Italy, and with which the monks are acquainted. It was disclosed to me by the Abbot Bucciarelli, sometime in the year 1841, and it would be easy to remove from the minds of the English all doubt on this subject, by explaining here the way in which it is done. But disclosure to the public of such an art, would not only verify the possibility, and even the facility of a practice which has been confidently affirmed as a fact, but it would enable

any dishonest persons to use it for the basest purpose,—to the destruction of commercial confidence, and the ruin of individuals, of mercantile houses, and of families. But there is another way in which the possibility of this practice may be verified to any candid mind ; and that is the testimony of several credible, respectable witnesses to the fact of its having been used as an experiment by me in their presence.

Several gentlemen connected with different religious sects, amongst whom was a Roman Catholic, engaged to be witnesses of the proposed performance. And one of them wrote a letter expressing, of course, his own sentiments. The engagement was, to take this letter in their presence and to write another, in which the sentiments should be quite at variance with those of the original, in precisely the same character of writing. At the conclusion of the experiment, all the witnesses, including the gentleman whose writing had been counterfeited, admitted the perfection of the resemblance in the two pieces of writing ; and their testimony is given in the following certificate :—

“*Liverpool, 2d January, 1845.*

“We, the undersigned, have witnessed an experiment performed, according to the mode as suggested, by Mr. Raphael Ciocchi, by which

any person may imitate and even forge letters so as not to be detected.

“WILLIAM ATHERTON, Wesleyan Minister.

“EDWARD BATTY, Surgeon.

“JOHN BURROWS, Surgeon.

“JOHN LOURESBOROUGH.

“REV. CHARLES LAWRENCE,
Saint Luke's Church.”

It is highly probable that Dr. Wiseman and the public who have read the Narrative may have entertained, in common, very rational doubts as to the truth of this case ; and that, what he has written on this subject may have been expressed with perfect sincerity, but under a perfect delusion. That there is, then, known an art which would enable persons to practise the fraud charged upon the monks is certain. That the monks are acquainted with it, can no longer be discredited : that they use it for purposes subservient to the interests of their order and institutions which it would not be honourable for them to avow is hardly questionable ; and that they actually *did* employ it to interrupt the correspondence between, at least, one novice and his family, my own experience has obtained for me the most conclusive evidence. Hence, all those weighty inferences, adverse to the credibility of the Narrative, which may have been drawn from

this part of it, are found to have nothing else to support them than the mere opinion of Dr. Wiseman, who, it may be charitably supposed, was utterly ignorant of the subject.

Having disposed of the question of falsifying the letters, it may be proper to notice again, in a very few remarks, that assertion in the article—“Mr. Ciocchi has himself taught us that it was easy enough to get servants to violate rules, and lend a hand to any secret service, especially conveyance of letters.” And for this the reader is referred to pp. 66, 74, &c. ; but nothing is even intimated there that it is even possible, much less that it is *easy*, for the novices to engage the servants in any prohibited transaction. They have no servants of their own choice or at their own disposal ; those engaged by the monks for the service of the monastery wait upon the youths during the novitiate. And the statements to which reference is made, relate to facts which occurred after I had taken the vows ; and when, under ordinary circumstances, the young monks are allowed, subject to certain regulations, to visit their parents. The first case that is adduced to illustrate how easily the servants may be engaged by the novices to violate the rules of the establishment, is that of the sacristan (not an ordinary servant) having conveyed privately to me, during my convalescence, a packet of letters, and offering to take charge of the answers I might wish to

send. The other case is that of my own servant* having been engaged by D. Alberico Amatori, the librarian of a neighbouring monastery of the same order, a man enjoying the confidence and friendship of his fellow monks, to convey some books privately into my room. There is nothing in these transactions that leads to the conclusion at which Dr. Wiseman has arrived. They have nothing to do with the novices; and they, therefore, yield no support to the argument in which reference is made to them.

Much imputation is cast upon the character of the monks, in the statements contained in the Narrative of the use it is alleged they make of poison. And Dr. Wiseman facetiously remarks, "Surely, if Masters Ciocci and Apollonj gave their superiors trouble, it would be a much simpler process, and one more likely to serve the interests of their order, to send them about their business than to murder them.† Surely monks have com-

* After the *third* year's residence in the monastery, a young monk is allowed to engage his own servant, who is paid by his family.

† The superiors could not send them away; but they might put them to death.

"Those youths, then, that shall have professed are to be placed by the procurator-general in the monasteries of those professed, prescribed by the holy congregation, under suitable masters, according to their capacity; wherein the youths must dwell at least for three years further, under rigorous discipline; nor can

mon sense enough to see a middle course between being plagued by refractory pupils and giving them ratsbane! Will any one in his senses believe, that there is a body of *men*, putting aside their religious character, who

they be first placed elsewhere, unless they be priests, or ordained *in sacris*, which then will be, according to the will of the Father-General."—Constitutions of the Monks, cap. xv. 86.

"The monks must obey the abbot, as the members do the head; and disobedient monks shall be put to death."—Regulæ S. Bened., tract xli., cap. 1, p. 2. Cardinalis Taurecremata.

Now, Dr. Wiseman, at the time of writing the above remarks, either knew that the Cistercian superiors have the power to put disobedient monks to death, or he did not. If he did not, then he was not a fit person to write the article of which they are a part; and if he did, it was the height of disingenuousness to write them. For, as a Roman Catholic bishop, he ought not to be ashamed, even if he were alone before a whole Protestant community, of the institutions of his own infallible (?) Church; nor to have paid the compliment to public opinion, by disavowing the conduct of an abbot in such a case, because, in the estimation of Protestants, it is a *moral* injustice; for he, in asserting the rectitude of Catholic institutions, ought not to deem it such. If Dr. Wiseman knew that Cistercian superiors have such power as the above law gives them, why did he not show the moral courage to vindicate the exercise of it, rather than say, "*what serious evils must it not bring on them?*" Aye, truly, *what* serious evils would it bring on them? or, what had they to fear in their own Church, whose members must submit to all ecclesiastical authority, when they could justify themselves by a reference to the original and standing laws of their order?

would make nothing of killing off youths when they got troublesome, instead of at once dismissing them? What good on earth could it do them? What serious evils must it not bring on them?"

There is nothing alleged by Dr. Wiseman to vindicate the monks from the grave charge which has been brought against them, beyond a clever statement of improbabilities. And these, it may be allowed, might be sufficient wholly to discredit the charge, if Italy were such as England is. But it must be admitted that, in every thing which relates to the freedom of thought and inquiry, the two countries are extremely dissimilar. And that, whilst in England an accusation made against any person may be strictly examined, and the grounds of it fully disclosed, in Rome the influence and power of the sacerdotal orders are sufficient to secure them generally from the imputation of crime. The extreme deference with which the sacred function of a minister of religion is regarded, pervades all classes of society where Roman Catholicism alone may be professed. A priest or a monk is deemed a sacred person, who, having professed a renunciation of those interests which connect men with this world, is given up to the high and holy interests which are involved in the belief and anticipation of a future state of bliss. And hence it is presumed that he is superior to the influence of those passions

which display themselves in avarice, ambition, jealousy, and revenge. The current reputation of these men answers, then, their worldly purpose as much as real sanctity of character, in elevating them, in the estimation of the secular part of the community, above the general suspicion of immorality. And it serves as a shield to repel any insinuations which might be hinted, that they are not what they should be. Whilst then the knowledge of private actions remains within the precincts of a man's own consciousness, and that of persons who have a community of interests with him, all that is debasing in the surrender of reason and conduct to the dominion of the lower passions and impulses of the human mind, and all that is revolting in cruelty, may mar his character, without destroying his reputation in society, or even rendering it questionable.

It is nowhere asserted, or even insinuated in the Narrative, as Dr. Wiseman, it appears, would have his readers believe, that the monks *contemplate* any such thing as the violent death of any who join their order. On the contrary, it is believed that their most careful assiduity is engaged to connect the interests of the novices with those of their institution. One of the first principles by which their conduct is determined is, that the stability of their institutions must be maintained, and their interests advanced, by all the means in

their power. It is evident that these ends are reached when the youths enter voluntarily, pass, as a matter of course, through the novitiate, take the vows, and, by surrendering their property to the monastery, bind their own interests firmly and permanently to the existing order of things. Where the pupils evince no reluctance to conform to what the regulations of the establishment demand of them, there is no need of artifice to accomplish the end proposed. And where there is an unwillingness, at first, to comply with what may be required, the pupils are generally brought, at length, to acquiesce, without recourse being had to extreme measures. The pertinacity with which I admit myself to have resisted the demands of the monks, I believe to be an unusual case. Hence the temptations to violence, I presume, are rare also. There are seldom found cases any ways analogous, in their tendency, with regard to the interests of the order, to that of D. Alberico Amatori, who wished to separate, with the fourteen other monks who respected his instruction, for the purpose of making an experiment at reforming his order. And the death, sometime afterwards, of six of the persons who were connected with him, has an ominous indication that, in extraordinary cases, the monks can act with a fatal determination against those with whom they are incensed.

The confidence with which the charge against the monks was made, of their having administered poison to me, was the result of something more than the suffering it occasioned, and the suspicious circumstances connected with that transaction. When I made an application to the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for a declaration of the nullity of my vows, one of the principal grounds on which the petition was urged, was the intrigue and violence that had been used to induce me to take them; and, subsequently, the attempt on my life by means of poison. It is hardly credible that such an accusation would have been entertained, if it had not been supported by other evidence than my bare statement founded upon mere suspicion. But Dr. Riccardi supported that statement, by a certificate that my illness had been occasioned by poison. And it was chiefly on that evidence, that a declaration was granted declaring the nullity of all the vows, excepting that of celibacy. It is not very likely that a respectable physician would pledge his reputation to a mere improbability, affirmed as a fact, for no other reason than to criminate an order of men estimable in the eyes of the community, unless he had some personal end to be answered by doing so. Nor is it more worthy of belief that he would lightly render himself liable to any consequences which a false statement in support of so serious a charge

might bring upon him ; and hazard, at the same time, the credit of his profession. Nothing can be conceived sufficient to induce a man of probity and honour to give a certificate such as that by which the Congregation was influenced, less than a perfect assurance that he was giving his testimony to an undoubted fact.

Dr. Wiseman adds, in a note (p. 271) " Last year an ex-Dominican friar and a priest was convicted in Rome, of the cruel treatment of a ward, which ended in the child's death. In spite of every effort to the contrary, he was degraded and executed. This does not look like any toleration of such murder as Mr. Ciocchi would have us believe the Pontifical Government coolly permits."

Since this case has been adduced with the view to show that justice is administered with integrity in Rome, it may be proper to give a more particular account of the circumstances and character of the offender, the nature of the offence, the manner in which it was discovered, and the result of the trial.

The facts are stated in a letter from Rome, dated the 2d of September, 1843, and published in the "Times" newspaper of the 6th of October, following ; and in a letter from Leghorn, of the 8th of October, published in the "Siècle," of the 16th of the same month.

"The priest Abbo, who was some time since

condemned to death for the murder of his nephew, but whose sentence has since been commuted to twenty years' imprisonment, is a man who joined to the most profound learning a remarkable address and superlative hypocrisy, covering, by all the appearance of a rigid morality and religion, the most infamous disorders and the most horrible crimes. He is a native of Genoa, and contrived to gain the friendship and patronage of the prime minister, who is his fellow-citizen. All the most illustrious houses were open to him ; and in two days after that on which his crime was detected and exposed, he was to (have) been raised to the prelacy. For several years he had charged himself with the education of his nephew, a child between eight and nine years old, the son of Jerome Abbo, who lived at Genoa. The priest Abbo weekly wrote to his brother, giving flattering accounts of the boy's health, and the progress he was making in his learning. At the same time the neighbours were distressed by hearing, night and day, plaintive cries from the poor child who was never seen to stir out. On being questioned as to the cause of this, Abbo replied, that his nephew was attacked with a painful complaint which required the most unremitted treatment. At the end of last year the cries and groans of the sufferer became almost incessant, until they gradually sank into total silence. Then, without any intimation of his death, a coffin

was brought into the priest's apartment, and preparations for a funeral were made. A dreadful suspicion arose in the mind of a woman who lived in the same house, who hastened to make a declaration to the magistrates. Meeting a police officer in the way she made the communication to him; and he was in time to meet the funeral in the street, and order it back into the house. A surgeon who was sent for, on having the coffin opened, and seeing the body, was so overcome by the spectacle that he fainted. To the four posts of the poor child's bed were attached cords which had been used to distend his limbs, while he underwent the most cruel tortures; and the cords were seen lying deep in the flesh. When the frightful tale was communicated to his Holiness, he could not refrain from weeping. At the trial, a woman who had lived with him as servant was examined, and not only confessed that she was then with child by the prisoner, but that she had had two previous children by him, both of whom he had made away with."

The following quotation from the "Siècle," shows that for once the voice of the people in Rome made itself regarded even by the Pope:

"We have received from Leghorn a letter of the 8th October, which announces, amongst other news worthy of attention, the execution of the priest Abbo, to whom the Papal Government was willing to show favour, to the great

scandal of all Italy. The voice of the people has for once prevailed over the influence of the Roman purple. This is our information:

"It appears by letters from Rome, that the priest Abbo, that scoundrel of whom so much has been said, was at last executed on the morning of the 4th; the Papal Government being apprehensive of public exasperation on this occasion, the execution did not take place in the city, but in the castle of St. Angelo. Almost all the garrison was under arms."

It needs not now to be inquired who had so much sympathy with a man of such finished criminality as to become interested in saving his life? It was not the poor, whom his bounty might have attached to him in gratitude, if any such there were; nor the ignorant who, in the want of discrimination, would not recognise the extent of his turpitude. But it was the cardinals,—men placed high in ecclesiastical rank, and charged with watching over the interests of the Church, and of checking the progress of whatever might have a tendency to subvert its interests, or impair its influence, and especially Cardinal Lambruschini, who is still living at Rome.

But reference was made to this case to show that the Papal Government does not tolerate murder. It has not been implied that it does so when the facts are rendered notorious, as in the instance now under consideration, of which information was brought directly to the police,

which it would have been a flagrant neglect of duty in them not to notice. Yet there was a woman who had allowed a priest to murder her two infants, and then to murder, by protracted tortures, his nephew, without ever divulging the secret, until she was called before the tribunal of justice to give evidence against the murderer. It may be readily supposed that the inducements which were sufficient to neutralize, at least for a time, the affections of a mother were not of a trivial kind. This murderer of his own infants retained his reputation, and was advancing to higher honours in the church, when the honest indignation of a lady, which had been excited against him by the strongest suspicion, and which was capable, no longer, of enduring the restraints of timidity or reluctance, led to the disclosure of his third murder.

The criminal was executed at last, it appears, not because the Papal Government administers justice with integrity, for it was willing to spare him; but because, for once, it felt itself too weak to save a priest, without hazarding, as an alternative, an insurrection in the city.

All these facts, when fully stated, show something different from any remarkable vigilance in the police of Rome, and from a very rigid or impartial execution of the law for murder. They render it sufficiently evident how possible it is for a person holding the

sacred office of a minister of religion to pass without suspicion, though he may be guilty of the blackest crimes. They offer their conclusive testimony that a priest *may* assure himself of secrecy in committing the greatest outrage on humanity, from any thing in the persons necessarily connected with him, or dependent on him. And they prove that the current reputation which these orders of men enjoy in Rome is no evidence of their integrity. On what ground, then, are the people of England called upon to disbelieve the charge of poisoning in a monastery, where everything was favourable to secrecy? The real ground on which this part of the Narrative is discredited, appears now, to be limited to this,—that the persons have not been actually convicted of murder before the magistrates, and sentenced to condign punishment. But what of that? Abbo was not accused of the murder of his two infants, until the murder of his nephew had been discovered, and proved against him. Some better arguments, if not evidence, seem therefore necessary to exculpate the Cistercian monks of San Bernardo, from the charge which has been made against them, before the assent of the English can be justly claimed to their innocence.

The circumstances of my profession in the monastery are next called in question (p. 272). And in a note we have this remark :—"Mr. Ciocci tells us, that as a pre-

liminary the barber came to shave his head. But he, quite amazed, asked what he wanted, as he had no beard, and his hair was short. The superior, of *course*, tries to deceive him, and tells that it was necessary only that the tonsure should be made. 'This is a formality.' At the first touch of the razor, he felt his indignation kindle, &c. Yet, observe, that he had received the tonsure at seven, and must have worn it till now. Whence then the amazement? Whence the indignation?"

It may be sufficient, in reply to this, to say, that the tonsure to which I had submitted in the first instance, was that which is received by the secular clergy,—the shaving of a small circle upon the crown of the head; whilst that of the Cistercian monks consists in shaving off the hair, from a narrow space from the temples to about the middle of the occiput.

Dr. Wiseman says:—"We were not aware that P. Abbate D. Nivardo Tassini was a bishop." That is very possible. There are other things, too, of which he was "not aware," but which are nevertheless true. And if he had had the moderation to make a similar admission with respect to them also, his article would not have been, on that account, the less valuable.

"But," he says, "really, unless Mr. Ciocci would have us believe that there was something so transcendently super-excellent in himself as would make the Cistercian order deter-

mined to secure him, in spite of himself, at any cost of lying, forgery, violence, and perjury (for the notarial declaration was equivalent to an oath); of hypocrisy, too, impiety, and sacrilege, we cannot imagine how else to explain the transaction. Out of four-and-twenty youths, he was the only one who resisted; was he so necessary to them that they could not forego him, but would wade up to the neck in vice and crime to have him? Of what use would a factious, discontented, rebellious member be to the order? What credit, support, or benefit could he gain for it?"

I have not laid claim to any merit, either in my literary attainments or in my intellectual powers, as a reason why the Cistercian monks evinced, by every means in their power, a determination to attach me to their order. I am perfectly willing to admit, that the desire to secure me might proceed from no higher motive than that of merely gaining a member. As to talent, Dr. Wiseman may probably be aware that they have not the honour of ranking amongst themselves men of remarkable genius; whilst, as he has had personal acquaintance with individuals of that order, he should have known that they do not hold literature in *very* high estimation. Nor is eminence of any other kind made by them a condition, or a term of membership. Whence, then, all this sarcasm? to what end does it tend?

But there were some circumstances which may be mentioned that might supply an adequate motive for the Cistercians to employ unusual means for obtaining pupils. It may be stated here, that they do not open their monasteries for the admission of pupils every year as other orders do ; but at intervals of several years. For their order became so unpopular some years ago that they had a difficulty in obtaining pupils at all. And when there were candidates for admission to the novitiate, there were so few that some would have to wait several years until a sufficient number could be obtained to join them. The paucity of members was at one time such that the Pope threatened to unite them to another order. This would have been like the dissolution of their institutions. And the fear of such an event would be quite sufficient to drive them to the use of means, which might not be openly avowed, for the purpose of obtaining pupils.

The Cistercians had, moreover, recently brought scandal upon their order by gross immorality. The students frequently accompanied the prior in his visits to the *palazzo apostolico del Quirinale* ; and whilst he was engaged in the company of the curate who occupied that part of the building, they were admitted to associate with respectable families, who were numerous there. They, however, abused the courtesy with which they were

received ; and the character of some of the female members of those families became the victim of their dissoluteness. Complaints were made of these disorders ; and it became necessary to represent the case to the Superior-General, P. Abbot Nasini. He did not, however, take effectual measures to suppress them ; the conduct of the young men became openly known ; and the Pope ordered that they should be distributed amongst other monasteries. But it was not only in Rome that the Cistercian order fell into disrepute. In Turin, where the religious orders are held in the greatest respect by the Government, the immorality of the Cistercians became, a few years ago, so flagrant that the King, Charles Albert, was obliged to suppress their monastery, called Santa Maria della Consolata.

The scandal was brought upon the order by these events only a few years before I entered the monastery of San Bernardo ; what reason is there, then, for astonishment that the monks evinced so firm a resolution to retain every pupil whom they might acquire ? And although in a monastery so well endowed as theirs is, the property which would fall to it by the admission of this one member, might take a very subordinate place in their estimation ; yet it should not be wholly excluded from the consideration by which the monks were influenced, seeing that some of the members whom they admit are

not able to add any thing to the resources of the establishment.

In p. 273, there is a notice of that part of the Narrative in which I had described my visit to my family after the expiration of the novitiate ; of the discovery of the fraud which had been practised upon me in the correspondence, and the indignation I felt at the discovery ; and of the efforts which my mother made to induce me to return to the monastery against an apparent determination of my own not to do so. One of the motives by which she urged me to submit to her advice, was a promise that when the course of study should have been completed, the proper means should be used to obtain the nullity of my vows. And then is added this remark, " Yet his mother, who now knows how he has been deceived, and how wretched he has been, coolly tells him to go back to his murderous prison for two or three years more, when every one in Rome knows, that to get vows declared null it is necessary to apply as soon as possible after they have been taken. We cannot understand the conduct of an affectionate mother to have been such as Ciocci describes it," &c.

Now, to all this it may be replied that my mother knew it was unlawful for her to detain me at home, or even allow me to remain there ; and that if she had yielded to my wishes, not only I should be taken by force

and punished as an apostate,* but that the members of my family for having permitted me to remain there would be immediately prosecuted as abettors of my apostacy. It was evident that the mingled feelings which she indulged, under an effort to control them, were those of maternal affection and respect for the religious order. The sympathy with which she regarded my condition had not subdued the esteem which she had always entertained for those whom she had been taught to believe were devout men. Nothing transpired at this interview calculated to excite an alarm for my *safety* on my return to the monastery, which she had no reason, therefore, to regard as "my *murderous prison*." And hence the attempt which is shown in the above quotation from the Review, to discredit this part of the Narrative by an appeal to the common sentiments of humanity, is quite irrelevant ; since it supposes her to have been aware of my exposure to imminent danger, of which she had received no intimation.

And then, as to the nullity of the vows,

*"Whoever of our monks shall have apostatized from the order, immediately conversation with him there is to be avoided by all the other brethren ; and when any apostate monk shall be known to be in any place, the General and every other abbot procurator, are to cause him to be imprisoned, calling in, if necessary, even the aid of the secular court."—Constitutions of the Monks, Distinction xi. cap. 8.

although much importance may be attached by the *parties themselves* to the making of an application as soon as possible after they have been taken, yet the decrees of the Council of Trent allow the application to be made at any time within five years after making the profession ; and it is incredible that “*every one in Rome*” should be ignorant of this fact. The following quotation is explicit on this point : “Every regular who pretends to have entered in religion, by force or fear, or shall say that he professed before the age specified ; and will abandon the habit for whatever cause, or again if he abandons the habit without the licence of the superiors, he shall not be heard in defence except during the first five years only, which shall be reckoned from the day of his profession ; and then, not otherwise, if he has not stated the causes which he pretends to have, before his superior and his ordinary.”—Council of Trent, Sess. 25, Chap. 19.

We pass on to notice “the very climax of Mr. Ciocchi’s horrors,” as Dr. Wiseman expresses it (p. 274); and that this may be the better understood, it will be requisite to recur in a few words to the plan of Don Alberico Amatori, for *the reformation of his order*. Nothing appeared in his conversations on the proposed plan, to indicate a desire to extend his interference beyond these limits. It was not the subversion of the monastic order of which he was a member, but the revival of those

pious and devout exercises by which the early Christians cultivated the sentiments and habits of godliness. Now as he proposed to do this without interfering with the existing established institutions of the Catholic Church, and under the sanction of its hierarchy, it appears to have been something different from “erecting in the very heart of it” (that is of “a Catholic religious order,”) “a *Protestant community*, directly rejecting the fundamentals of the Catholic faith.” But *some* Catholics, it is well known, in common with Protestants, regard Holy Scripture as the *original source* whence men derive all their knowledge of Divine realities ; it was then, in respect of them, only a more strict recurrence to the first principles of religion that D. Alberico wished to produce. This is obvious, from his remarks on the declension which had taken place in the cherishing of devout sentiments in the Church, since the time of the fathers, whose fervent glow of piety was sustained by the diligent study of the Bible. And when D. Alberico Amatori saw that the writings of these venerated men had been elevated to the *first place*, and that the Divine word was reduced to a *subordinate rank*, it seems difficult to conceive with what *deference to the sacred writings* it can be maintained in England, that his proposition was “scandalous,” (p. 275,) whatever may have been thought of it at Rome. Nor was it, as Dr. Wiseman says, “throwing a

slur" on the homilies of the fathers, that those writings were reduced to occupy the second rank in sacred literature, whilst that book which the authors of them regarded with the deepest veneration, was to be restored to its primitive importance. His project for reforming his order, was *Protestant* only so far as it related to the respect which he had to Holy Scripture. No other part of it interfered with the institutions and usages of the Catholic Church. He left undisputed the authority of tradition in the Church, and many other things which Protestants universally disallow.

However, "the modest application was made to the superior of a Catholic religious order, for permission to erect in the very heart of it, a *Protestant community* directly rejecting the fundamentals of Catholic faith." (p. 274.) That is, the taking of "*the Bible alone as the rule of faith*," is "directly rejecting the fundamentals of *Catholic faith*." And hence "the fundamentals of Catholic faith" are contained in books which D. Alberico proposed to his friends that they should not respect as the rule of faith; that is, in books which all allow to be uninspired. Since, therefore, these "fundamentals of *Catholic faith*" are contained in works of merely human authority, and not in the *Divine word*, the "*Catholic faith*" must rest on *human authority*; and the religion which is its fruit cannot, obviously, be that which is so clearly described in the New

Testament, as "the fruits of the Spirit:" for human principles cannot produce Divine results. But a Church of which the "fundamentals of faith" rest on human authority *must* be a human institution. Such is not, however, the Church of Christ. The Divine Head, which it owns as "the Author and Finisher of its faith," instituted it in the days of his humanity, gave to it a constitution of spiritual peculiarities, and promised to the members who composed it, that the Spirit of Truth should guide them into all truth; and that he would be with it always, even to the end. This is then the clear distinction between the authority of faith which the Church of Christ acknowledges, and that which the Church of Rome, according to the statement of one of its bishops, acknowledges.

Much exception is taken to a part of Amatori's discourse given in p. 68, of the Narrative, and quoted in p. 275 of the Review: "The Bible is become a book almost disused. Here and there a priest or a monk may be found who hurriedly repeats a few scattered fragments, a few mutilated Psalms, and that is all." For it is said "that *every* priest and *every* monk recites the Breviary, in which are *all* the Psalms entire without the slightest mutilation; and that the Breviary and Missal do not contain a few scattered fragments, but large and principal portions of the Old and New Testaments." Now it is freely admitted that the Psalms are

inserted entire in the Breviary, which "*every* priest and *every* monk" are *supposed* to recite. He spoke, and he was understood to speak, of the whole Church by the expression "the faithful," whose only book in the early ages was the Bible. And it was in reference to the change which had taken place *generally* that these words were used; for as the Bible now rarely comes into the possession of the laity, at least in Italy, the paucity of those who are admitted to read it is true in comparison of the whole Church of which he spoke.

Indeed, the reading of Holy Scripture in the vulgar tongues is prohibited to members of the Catholic Church. This privilege has been carefully guarded against through many ages by the Popes and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. And within the present century very careful attention has been given by the Popes to prevent the members of the Church of Rome from possessing this book. "The Encyclical letter of Pope Gregory XVI.," may be referred to as authority on this subject; and the following passages from it are worthy of attention. "With regard, however, to Bibles translated into the vulgar tongues, it was the case even many centuries since, that in various places the holy dignitaries were obliged at times to exercise increased vigilance, when they discovered that versions of this sort were either read in secret conventicles, or were actively distributed by heretics. To this refer

the admonitions and cautions issued by Innocent III., our predecessor of glorious memory, concerning assemblies of laics and women, secretly held in the diocese of Metz, under a pretence of piety, for reading the Scriptures; and also the peculiar prohibitions of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, which we find to have been issued in France soon after, and in Spain previous to the sixteenth century." And after having referred to various prohibitions on the same subject, the letter proceeds,— "Moreover we confirm, and by apostolical authority renew, the aforesaid directions already issued concerning the publication, distribution, reading, and retention of books of the Holy Scripture translated into the vulgar tongues; while with respect to other works of whatever author, we wish to remind all persons that the general rules and the decrees of our predecessors, prefixed to the index of prohibited books are to be abided by; and consequently, not only are those books to be avoided, which are by name included in the same index, but those also to which the aforesaid general directions refer.

"At the same time it will be your duty to seize out of the hands of the faithful, not only Bibles translated into the vulgar tongue, published contrary to the above directions of the Roman pontiffs, but also proscribed or injurious books of every sort; and thus to provide that the faithful may be taught by your monitions

and authority *what sort of pasture they should consider salutary to them, and what noxious and deadly.*"

And with respect to the term "mutilated," it may be explained that the word "*smozzicati*," used in the original, was intended to apply to the manner in which they are recited; as it is customary in reciting the services of the Church, to run over them with the greatest possible rapidity of speech, and in doing so, syllables and even words are commonly omitted, whilst the attention of the mind cannot be engaged by the sentiments contained in those compositions. Instead, therefore, of *smozzicati* having been rendered by "*mutilated*," the word "*clipped*" would have been more appropriate.

But it is well known at Rome, and Dr. Wiseman should have known, too, contrary to his very positive declaration, that "*every* priest and *every* monk" do not recite the Breviary. Many are employed in public duties, on account of which they are exempted from the obligation to recite the Breviary, and instead of this they are required to say fifty-one Ave Marias. The charge of telling "deliberate lies" appears now to contain less of truthfulness than of confidence. And with respect to "the Commentaries of the Holy Fathers, translated from the French," which Don Alberico procured for his young friend, there is in the same paragraph this significant question, "Why

have them translated *from the French?*" Truly, for the use of those who had not studied that language.

When Don Alberico's application was made to the Holy Congregation,* to be allowed to retire, with the fourteen other monks to a monastery, to live in the observance of his proposed rule of faith and conduct, they were all denounced by the superior of the Cistercian order, before that assembly, as heretics and apostates. Don Alberico had, however, some friends, as Cardinal Mai, Cardinal Polidori, and the Abbot Palloti. Hence, although at his first application to the congregation of Bishops and Regulars, silence had been imposed on him, yet the support of these men obtained for him a second hearing; and his request was then evaded, though not refused. For as Cardinal Patrizzi, the Prefect, was favourable to the Cistercian superior, and yet did not choose to give a direct refusal to the application, those who had opposed it at first seemed to yield; and the monastery of

* The words used in the original, in speaking of this assembly, were "*sacra congregazione*," which were rendered, according to their true sense, holy convocation. "*Sacra Congregatio*" are words occurring repeatedly in works on Roman ecclesiastical laws and discipline. Is it possible that a professor of a college at Rome, as Dr. Wiseman was for several years, can be so utterly unacquainted with these works as not to have heard of this assembly?—See "Review," p. 275.

Santa Maria a Foce was granted to Amatori and his friends. All the revenue of the monastery, except that for the maintenance of the church, was, however, alienated; a condition which rendered the project impracticable. And thus the object of the superior of the order was gained, with the insidious appearance of moderation.

But the sense in which Dr. Wiseman explains the imposition of silence is not the true sense; that is, not the sense in which it was understood by any of the parties whom it concerned. He says (pp. 275-6), It "means, in the judicial language of Rome, allowed each side to hold its opinion, and forbade either to impugn the other. In other words, this awful tribunal, speaking the sentiments of the Church of Rome, has pronounced, that any person, and a Catholic, may in Rome maintain the *Bible alone* to be the rule of faith, and no one must gainsay him!" The sentence did not relate *to the holding of this opinion*. The subject to which it related was, whether Amatori's proposed reform should be allowed or not; and the sentence, relating *only to this matter*, determined that it should not, without any question being raised as to the *principle* which had given rise to the idea of it. As his exposition is at variance with truth, it must, in proportion to the confidence with which it is given, detract from the claim to respect which the article might otherwise

appear to possess; and betray, at the same time, the inadequacy of truth for the purpose for which it was written.

It may be proper to revert here to a subject which has been already noticed, that of administering poison in the monasteries, for the purpose of noticing a passage in the Review, and of correcting a trivial chronological error in the Narrative. "Surely," says Dr. Wiseman (p. 276), "it is now high time for the order to get rid of Ciocchi and his new master in mischief. It would be easy, after such an affair, to get them expelled the order, or to remove them elsewhere. Instead of this, see the creditable way in which they go to work. They *poison* all, *except these two*! Six escape death, after many months' illness, the others die at very regular intervals of about two months; so that two abbots and four fathers are despatched in a very short time."

The deaths of the monks, which it was considered occurred under very suspicious circumstances, were mentioned merely as incidents, of which it was not thought important to state with more distinctness the order. They did not all happen during the second year of my residence in the monastery; some occurred after that period. And the ineffectual attempt on my life was made between the time of the death of Don Andrea Gigli, and that of D. Eugenio Ghioni:—thus bringing the other events mentioned in the concluding paragraph

of the second year, down to a somewhat later period. But the facts of these deaths are not impugned otherwise than by general and sarcastic expressions of doubt, which the English will be at no loss to distinguish from counter-evidence.

The reader is here apprized of a distinction which it is necessary to make with respect to outrages in which any of the religious orders are implicated. If they are the only persons involved in criminal transactions, the interests of the Church are supposed to be served by concealing the facts, so as to prevent a public scandal from being brought upon religion. But if any account of the disorders or crimes transpires, and the facts become notorious, so that it is not possible to gainsay them before the community at large, a different motive is presented, and it is a higher policy to cause an investigation to be instituted, and an appearance of justice maintained, than to allow the matter to pass. Two or three instances may be sufficient here for illustration. One is the case mentioned by Dr. Wiseman in a note (pp. 276-7).

“A few years ago shots were fired at night into the window of the superior of the Greek monastery of Grottaferrata, near Rome. He was not hurt, but died some months after from the fright. There was a suspicion that some young and discontented religious (monks) had been parties to the outrage, by procuring it to be

committed. A severe investigation took place: Cardinal Mattei was appointed to inquire into the whole business. In the meantime the regular authorities of the house were superseded, and the suspected monks were closely confined in other religious houses. The inquiry was conducted with the utmost rigour; all the guilty parties were severely punished, some we believe by imprisonment for life; the monastery deprived of its own government, and a superior from another order placed over it. Yet we are to believe that fourteen monks, including abbots, could be coolly poisoned in a religious house in Rome, and attract no notice!”

The second case is that of poisoning Cardinal Placido Zurla, the Pope's vicar and confidant. This occurred in Sicily; and the report of it obtained currency both there and in Rome. Some circumstances had given rise to dissensions in the monasteries of Sicily; and they were carried on with so much violence that the king, Ferdinand II., at length interfered with the hope of restoring order and tranquillity. With this view he invited Cardinal Placido Zurla into his dominions. It was during this visit that the monks of Palermo gave him a sumptuous dinner; and immediately after the repast, being seized with violent pains, he said to his secretary Monsignor D. Vincenzo Massoni, “*I have only one hour to live; call a confessor!*” The

result verified his exclamation. Dr. Franchini was engaged to prepare the body of the Cardinal to be sent to Rome. And in the application of his new method of desiccating corpses by injection, he found extreme difficulty, from the effects of the powerful poison which had been taken into the system.

To these cases may be added the death of Pope Leo XII., which occurred in February, 1829, and which was currently ascribed to a surgical operation performed by Signor Sisco, under advice from the sacred college. The cardinals were apprehensive that a reform, which the Pope had evinced a determination of effecting, would interfere with their luxurious habits of life ; and the death of the Pope would save them from that fear. Public opinion was found, on the morning after the death of the Pope, to have been uttered in the usual way of Roman satire, by the words "*bene merenti*" (well deserved) having been written in very large characters on the door of the surgeon's house. They remained there several hours after daylight, and hundreds of persons had an opportunity of seeing them. Cardinal Micara, who planned the reform, has never since been regarded with cordiality by his brethren, with whom he has little intercourse, as he lives retired from Rome and seldom visits the city. But, notwithstanding the generality of the opinion, no inquiry was made into the cause of the Pope's death, nor was

anything done to exculpate the surgeon from the suspicion of having occasioned it.

In the first case mentioned, the outrage was committed by persons belonging to the secular portion of society ; and no scandal was brought upon the religious institutions by inflicting the severest punishment upon them ; the defence of the religious orders rather required that the matter should be investigated. But the disclosure of circumstances placed a number of young monks under suspicion of having instigated the actual perpetrators of this outrage to the commission of the crime. The latter were, however, it appears, severely punished, whilst those who were the authors and abettors of the crime, and accessaries to the real commission of it, and who were really the most criminal offenders, were sent to be confined in other monasteries, with the range of only the commodious building and the beautiful garden attached to it ; a punishment not very severe, it will be admitted, considering the heinous character of the offence ; but the distinction is sufficient to show how lenient the law is in Rome towards the monks, notwithstanding the atrocity of their conduct.

In the second case, in which *only the monks* were implicated in the death of the Cardinal, there was not even an inquiry instituted, although the religious orders do not enjoy the same extent of privileges there which they do in Rome ; and the government was the more

bound to visit the offenders with punishment, inasmuch as the Cardinal had gone at the express invitation of the King. But it was expedient that the character of the religious orders should not be proclaimed by criminal prosecution and punishment. For the disclosure, which would have been inevitable, in prosecuting an entire religious community for murder, would have alienated the respect of the lay population from the monastic institutions and religious orders. The Church of Rome could better afford to lose one cardinal than so much respect and influence as would have been hazarded by judicial proceedings against the monks.

It appears, then, that the Court of Rome is controlled by motives of policy, immediately relating to the stability of its religious orders, whether offences shall be inquired into, and the offenders brought to punishment, or not. And although the fact of a company of young monks being *put under restraint* for engaging a band of assassins to shoot the superior of their order, a crime endangering the stability of their institution, may have been alleged as evidence that crime is impartially punished by the Roman government, it does not interfere with the general principle, which appears to control the course of justice under the pontificate. A secular is condemned to perpetual imprisonment for a crime to which he had been instigated by a monk ; whilst the latter, who is the

“architect and plotter ” of the crime, is merely sent for a short time to another monastery, without liberty to leave the enclosure of its garden walls.

Now, on comparing these transactions, if they are susceptible of comparison, there will be no difficulty in perceiving that the instigation of a company of discontented young monks to shoot the superior of their monastery—the representative of the Pope, or the poisoning of a Cardinal, or even the unnatural death of Pope Leo XII., must be far more likely to provoke severe punishment, than any outrages which are related in the Narrative ; as in extenuation of these it might be pleaded that the objects of them were suspected, at least, of entertaining notions decidedly at variance with the prevailing habits of monastic life ; and, therefore, objects of distrust in respect of the general interests of their order.*

But it may be averred that the monks at Grottaferrata were only suspected : still, as “the inquiry was conducted with the utmost rigour,” it may be supposed, that not only was the suspicion of these young monks justified, but that others also were placed in a very doubtful relation to the outrage, since “the regular authorities of the house were superseded,” and “a superior from another order placed over it.” The very trivial punishment

* See Note from the Rules of St. Benedict (pp. 20, 21).

of the monks at Grottaferrata, and the entire impunity of those at Palermo, do not show that the Roman government rules its subjects with such "evenhanded justice," that the survivors of persons dying under very questionable circumstances in a monastery, would be likely to obtain satisfaction by any inquiry they might institute into the cause of the mysterious death which might interest them.

Now Dr. Wiseman would appeal to the sense of justice for which the people of England are so highly distinguished, to induce them to believe that the charge of poisoning is nothing more than a malicious fabrication of a monk who had apostatized from his order. "Will any one," he says (p. 276), "believe that 'in the nineteenth century' any community of men could be kept up, in which a few superiors poison not only their subjects, but their brother-superiors, like flies, without any notice being taken of it by the public, by the authorities, or, still more strange, by the survivors? Neither Don Alberico, nor Ciocci, seem to take the least step in consequence, nor do the lucky six who survive, to prove that the monks are not *sure* poisoners..... The families of these murdered men ask for no inquiry, and give themselves no trouble. The ecclesiastical authorities, in fine, must have seen that this sudden death fell on the very men who had been acquitted, when accused by the order before them, and there-

fore, one would think, must have resented the matter, and taken it up, and looked into it."

But if this passage be considered attentively, it will not, perhaps, be found either so forcible or so just as it at first appears. What else, for instance, would any one understand by these words,—“poisoning not only their subjects, but their brother-superiors, like flies,” than that an extraordinary number of sudden deaths had occurred in some monastery within a short period?—and not, as the fact was, that these six men died in *several* monasteries, at various places, some of them considerably distant from each other, at promiscuous intervals, extending over the period of about two years and a half; and some of them, only, suddenly; whilst others died after a somewhat protracted illness? It may be sufficient, here, merely to notice a fallacy in a quotation already made:—“Yet we are to believe that fourteen monks, including abbots, could be coolly poisoned in a religious house in Rome, and attract no notice!” This is *purely fictitious*; for the Narrative charges no such accumulation of crimes upon *one* monastery. The monks acted with too much precaution for that. But it intimates *who* it is that “will dare to say any thing that serves his purpose” (p. 277); a charge which was made against me by Dr. Wiseman.

The reader should have been informed in what way “*the public*” could take notice of

these transactions in Rome, where, as he should have been also apprized, a person is in danger of being committed to prison for uttering a suspicion against the moral character of an ecclesiastic. Any person in Rome would be aware, that to raise a scandalous rumour against a religious order, would make himself obnoxious to a severe penalty, without attaining the righteous end which he might have in view.* Unless, therefore, it were evident in what manner unquestionable proof could be immediately adduced, to support the charge of murder, who would so lightly esteem his liberty, as to place it in the greatest danger, by imputing that grave crime to men highly respected for the apparent sanctity of their character?

Again, that "the *authorities*" did not inquire into these transactions, has in it nothing of the nature of evidence. For it was easy enough for the monks to give so plausible a statement of the cause of death, that they might have no reason to fear a judicial inquiry about it. And with respect to the "*ecclesiastical authorities*," it may be observed that these men had been impugned before them; and that *they* are not the men who might be expected to institute proceedings that would bring public obloquy upon the religious orders which

* Some cases of imputed insanity are mentioned in a note at the end.

mainly constitute the firm basis of their own power and greatness.

But, "still more strange, the survivors" did not inquire into the circumstances of these deaths. They had very good reason to remain quiet, since they were in the immediate power of the same men, to whose resentment they would have been obnoxious, if they had ventured on a course of such daring intrepidity, as that of impeaching their superiors of the crime of murder, who, they knew, could use sufficient precautions to prevent the proofs from transpiring.

And although "the families of these murdered men ask for no inquiry" (p. 276), yet it should not be forgotten that precautions had already been taken against such a contingency, by changing the residence of those men whose friends would be likely to give any trouble about their death. Don Andrea Gigli, for instance, who had many friends strongly attached to him in Chiaravalle, was removed to Rome, where it would be extremely difficult for these friends to institute any successful inquiries into the cause of his death; even if their liberty would not have been placed in imminent peril by such an attempt. Don Alberico Amatori was in a similar condition, when at length he was sent from Rome, where he had many friends, to Chiaravalle, where he was almost unknown. The friends of some, lived at places far from those at which they

suffered ; and others had no friends whose interference could be in the least apprehended.

But how could any *Catholic* impeach the Cistercian superiors of *crime*, and what right had the "*authorities*" to interfere, and what end would have been attained by "the families of these murdered men," or by the "survivors," making the most rigid inquiries, and even obtaining the most conclusive evidence of the facts of poisoning, whilst the superiors could point to the Rules of St. Benedict, and say, "Here is our authority?"

Again, it is worthy of notice, that during the time that the proposed reform was under discussion, no events like these occurred ; for besides the master of the novices, whose death is mentioned in the Narrative, and which was no more subject to inquiry than the others, no sudden or mysterious deaths were known to have occurred ; whilst those which followed the period of that discussion fell upon the persons who had been concerned in it. And it would have been a strange coincidence of fatality with the jealousy and hatred of the monks, that all these objects of their aversion should be so mysteriously attacked at a time when their own interests and ease would be the most effectually served by their death, if the hand of man had not been engaged in the transaction.

"But there was one monk," says Dr. Wiseman (p. 277), "not yet disposed of. Why a

middle course was pursued in his regard we cannot say ; but he was not poisoned, and yet he was not forgiven." And he adds this passage from the Narrative, "The monk Stramucci was sent to the monastery of San Severino in the marshes ; where, owing to the insalubrity of the situation, or from some other cause, in the course of a few months he was from a robust man reduced to a skeleton." It is most readily admitted that San Severino is not *in the marshes* ; but "San Severino nelle Marche" being a proper name, ought not to have been altered in the translation. I am quite willing to acknowledge this oversight, without any impeachment of my veracity, which, in respect of this statement, has been confidently assailed. Now, as I have never been at this place, I relied upon the testimony of the Cistercian monks that it really was insalubrious ; for when they acquainted me with the altered condition of Stramucci, they ascribed it to this cause ; and having no ground, from my own knowledge of the situation, to dispute this statement, I repeated it, without calling in question its accuracy. If, however, San Severino is situated in a *healthy* locality, the remarkable change which Stramucci soon experienced must be ascribed to some other cause, without exculpating the monks from any fraudulent hand in procuring it ; but rather tending to impeach some other principle in them besides their

veracity ; since, if a natural cause had produced the effect which was alleged, there could be no occasion to use falsehood for concealment.

I have further to acknowledge that I am indebted to the Cistercian monks also for the information relating to Chiaravalle, having never visited the place. Nor will I stay here to inquire whether the locality is essentially salubrious or otherwise. For who does not know that the dry and strong air of one place, or the humid air of another, which shall be the most suited to sustain the health and vigour of one person, shall prove fatal to another, of different constitution, and in a different state of health? But I had the testimony of only the monks, that the climate of Chiaravalle was calculated to injure the health of Don Alberico, or that it was *any thing noxious in the atmosphere* that did so ; and that those who live there, complain of being subject to habitual head-ache. This may possibly be occasioned by the drying and manufacture of tobacco, of which the place is the "great depôt" (p. 278).

But in saying that Chiaravalle was *on the frontier*, it was not meant that it was situated on the remotest borders of the state ; but, using the word in its more general sense, it was meant, that it was in the province bordering on the kingdom of Naples. The acceptation of the word "*Marca*," when applied

to a locality, will, however, justify the use of the word *frontier* in speaking of this place ; at the same time that it shows Dr. Wiseman to have been insufficiently acquainted with the proper use of Italian geographical terms.

I have stated that the reading of Holy Scripture in the monastery of San Bernardo at Rome, led me to view the doctrines of the New Testament in the same light in which I have since found they are regarded by Protestants. (Nar. pp. 75-78.) And although it is an object for deep and reverential gratitude that such a result was experienced, yet it does not now appear astonishing that it should have been so. The statement of the fundamentals of the Christian faith are made with such lucid evidence of their truthfulness, that it now appears to be doing violence to the words which are employed to express them, to understand them in their Roman acceptation. The best criticisms that I have seen on works of merely human authority, show that the interpretation of the doctrines of the New Testament by the theologians of Rome, is given upon principles very different from those on which philological inquiries are usually conducted. And hence the different relation which the works of the critic bear to his author is sufficiently accounted for. The student of Roman theology, on first turning over the pages of the New Testament, expects to find in it what he has been led by his teachers, to

suppose it contains on those points which are not believed by other churches. But if he applies the first principle of criticism in his examination, he does not find his expectations verified. For it is evident that the object of all the writers of the New Testament, was to direct the attention of man *immediately* to the sacrificial atonement of the adorable Redeemer as the only ground of his hope ; and they teach, that benefits are conferred on the christian church only by virtue of the mediatorial office he fills : whilst the Church of Rome directs the attention of the penitent to the Eucharist and the priest, as the necessary means of approaching God and obtaining his favour. The native force of the statements of the New Testament in constraining the acquiescence of the human mind, is known by those who invent a false, as well as by those who teach a true theology. And hence it is perceived that the general reading of divine truth would expose the art by which its sublime doctrines are mystified ; and lead, as a necessary consequence, to a distrust of that ecclesiastical system which is upheld by withholding or adulterating the word of life.

But the reader may be interested in seeing with how much force of evidence the statement of my having embraced Protestant sentiments could be called in question. For Dr. Wiseman says, “After this Ciocci gets from his friend, the librarian, a copy of the New Testament,

and reading it, becomes quite a Protestant. It is the old story : for he tells us how he came to conclusions about the blessed Eucharist, purgatory, confession, indulgences, &c., so pat to his present purposes, so nicely chiming with English *evangelical* notions, so exactly based upon the very arguments used by Exeter-hall champions, that really it is quite marvellous. In a word he became a complete Protestant : and it is clear from what he says, that if Luther, and Calvin, and Zuinglius, had never lived, he would in his cell, at San Bernardo, have hit upon exactly the same ideas with them, on those very points in which English Protestantism agrees with one or other of them—but only just on those ; so that his bible-reading led him to make for himself precisely, and to a tittle, that farrago of Wittenburg, Geneva, and Zurich theology, which constitutes evangelical Church-of-Englandism ! How lucky ! How true ?”

When the spleen and the sarcasm which pervade this passage are separated from it, the criticism which may remain, will not have sufficient merit to claim the most transient regard. It disproves nothing ; and it proves only a jealousy and an apprehension that the statements contained in the Narrative should be believed by the English.

Now there are two facts recorded in the Narrative, bearing on this subject ; and to which, as they occurred in Rome, it may be

useful to refer. The first of them is the interview which was obtained with the Hanoverian Ambassador, in the year 1838, and for which there was no other motive than that arising from a desire to converse with some person whose religious sentiments would enable him to sympathize with one who had recently embraced the revelation of the New Testament, as it is entertained by Protestants.

The second fact is that of my having shown Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge and her daughter, then the Princess Augusta, but now the Hereditary Grand Duchess of Mecklenburgh Strelitz, over the church and garden of the Cistercian monastery. That so gross a violation of monastic discipline should have been resented with no penalty, should have passed without an inquiry, may appear strange; perhaps it has appeared incredible to many who are acquainted with the strictness of that discipline. Now, in the estimation of the Catholic hierarchy, there is scarcely a more aggravated breach of monastic order than that of introducing a lady into the garden of a monastery. And yet, in the face of day, and in the sight of the monks, whose windows overlooked the garden, this was done with impunity. In one of the bulls of Benedict XIV. there is the following passage on this subject. "It is clear that the observance of regular discipline (before it had been confirmed by the decretals

of councils, general and particular, of any nation or province, and which had been prescribed by the laws and the sanctions of the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, with regard to the forbidden entrance of any women, even though of the same blood, into the cloister of any of the monks) had been strictly observed, not only for all the females, but also for the males. There was no entry into the cloisters or limits of the monasteries, nor into the chapels or churches of the same monasteries; it was forbidden under very grave penalties. That as Pope St. Gregory, our predecessor, said, 'No occasion of scandal should be given in the houses of the servants of God, by which the souls of the simple might be troubled, which could not please God.'"* Why the punishment was not inflicted, perhaps it

*The principle on which this strict discipline is founded and enforced, may be traced to the estimation in which the Catholic Church teaches its members to hold the female sex. The following passage on "the love of chastity," is sufficiently clear on this point: it is taken from the Rules of St. Benedict, Commen. of Trin., par. 6.

Cohabitatio mulierum Vitanda.

"They should avoid and decline opportunities, and especially beware of intercourse (cohabitatio) with women, which is especially dangerous to chastity—For there are three things destructive to chastity—the limbs, the senses, and the thoughts. To the first are prohibited acts, to the second looks, and to the third affections. Therefore, let converse with women be by no means permitted to the clergy. What is a

is not easy to determine; and why Dr. Wiseman has not impugned this part of the Narrative, so reasonably the object of doubt, it is perhaps not easy to assign any other motive than that he suspected it would be coming "too near home;" and that his fallacies would be detected and exposed. For when a copy of the Narrative was presented to Her Royal Highness by the Rev. W. Harrison, some time ago, she said that "she perfectly remembered the occurrence. Her Royal Highness also mentioned, that Mr. Hutchinson, the British Chaplain at Rome, came over here, and told her that R. Ciocchi had escaped hither." She said she had also heard, "that R. C. had been obliged once or twice to hide himself in the Hanoverian Ambassador's house." The trifling inaccuracy as to the *cause* of the visit to the Hanoverian Ambassador's house does not affect the Narrative, whilst the currency of the report attests the fact.

We turn, once more, in following the order of the Review, to the case of poisoning in the monastery of San Bernardo, in order to no-

woman? She is a hurtful race, she is the gate of the devil, the road of iniquity, the stroke of a scorpion. When she approaches the stubble, she enkindles the fire. She consumes the conscience of him who dwells (with her) and burns up the foundations of the mountains.

"I consider that if women dwell with men, the views of the devil will not be absent."

tice two or three observations which are made upon this transaction. After the poison began to act upon the stomach and throat, in producing sensations of violent heat, and in occasioning a foaming at the mouth (Nar. p. 78), and the assembled monks became witnesses of my suffering, the master urged the duty of confession. "But," says Dr. Wiseman (p. 280), "he is too much of a Protestant for that, and refuses. Whereupon he is duly *exorcised* as *possessed*! Every Catholic knows that this can never be done, and never is done, without express leave from the bishop." It is not affirmed in the Narrative that I was *duly* exorcised. Dr. Wiseman knows best why he introduced the word which gives that additional force to the expression. And he ought to know also, that there are several forms of exorcism, some of which may be used by any priest. But never mind. He was not aware, that P. Abbate D. Nivardo Tassini was a bishop (p. 272); that is, he did not know that the superior-general of the Cistercian order not only wore the habits, but was invested with all the power and privileges, and exercised all the functions, of a bishop, in his order. Yet such is the fact. And even when a branch of the Cistercian order separate, and live in a distinct community, with the view to the more rigid observance of their rules, the superior of such reformed branch is invested with the same

power and privileges as a superior of the order from which they have seceded; as was the case at Fulda, which is shown by the following quotation from a bull of Pope Benedict the Fourteenth, book iv. page 13.

“By apostolic authority we perpetually erect the aforesaid abbey church, (for those regulars always remaining stedfast in it; and always zealous there, in every state, quality, domination, and every essential; so that hereafter, as heretofore, it shall never cease to be regular,) into a cathedral and episcopal church, which, as before, shall be immediately subject to the apostolic see; and we institute and honour with the episcopal name, title, and dignity, and declare that the abbots for the time being of the aforesaid monastery, are the true prelates and bishops of Fulda.”

Moreover, in this capacity, an abbot of a Cistercian monastery is required to take an oath of fidelity to the Pope; and the following is the “form of an oath to be taken by abbots of monasteries and others, having Churches with episcopal jurisdiction and separate territory.”

“I, N., elect of the church of N., from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord, the Lord N., Pope N., and to his successors canonically entering. I will neither advise, consent, nor do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their

persons may be seized, or hands anywise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel with which they shall intrust me by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to keep and defend the Roman Papacy, and the regalities of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the apostolic see, going and coming, I will honourably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church of our lord the Pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any council, action, or treaty in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman Church, any thing to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it all in my power, and, as soon as I can, will signify it to our said lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. *Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, or his aforesaid successors, I will to my power persecute and oppose.* I will come to a council

when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will, by myself, in person, visit the threshold of the apostles every three years; and give an account to our lord and his aforesaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things any wise belonging to the state of my church, to the discipline of my clergy and people; and, lastly, to the salvation of souls committed to my trust. And I will, in like manner, humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger thereto especially empowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage; or, in default of these, by a priest of the diocese, or in default of one of the clergy (of the diocese), by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above mentioned. And such impediments I will make out by lawful proofs, to be transmitted by the aforesaid messengers to the Cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the congregation of the sacred council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor any wise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the chapter of my church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff; and if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby

incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God." Decretum Greg. IX., lib. ii. tit. 24.

Dr. Wiseman continues, "After some other struggles a physician arrives, who is evidently in the secret; for he brings his medicine with him, which turns out to be only another dose of poison. Still he is a match for this, and insists on having his own physician, Dr. Riccardi, called in. Now, if the monks had poisoned him, and intended to kill him, it does not seem very likely that they will call in a man to snatch their victim from their deadly grasp, and to detect their villanous design. Nor is it probable that they will take care to leave the remains of the poison in the phial on the table. However, they do both."

Now, in the first place, it is not anywhere in the Narrative affirmed, that the physician who attended at the request of the Procurator-General, D. Girolamo Bottini, administered poison. It is not known who this man was, whether he administered anything of a noxious property, or whether he merely failed in administering that which would have been suited to give relief, or whether he was a *physician* at all: that is the capacity in which he *then*, but never afterwards, appeared in the monastery. Again, it is not likely that all the monks were "in the

secret." And when severe suffering had excited their commiseration, and no good reason could be alleged for refusing to call in Dr. Riccardi, the ordinary physician of the institution, as several of the monks joined in the request, consent was at length yielded, with the bad grace of refusing to allow either of the monks who offered their service to leave the monastery, and a reluctant permission was given for a menial servant to be sent. D. Candido Laurenzi, however, sent, by this man, a note to hasten the visit of the physician. It was not without policy that the consent of the superior was given. The stranger had been called in contrary to the usages of the establishment; and it would have subjected himself to a general suspicion, had he persisted in refusing to send for the ordinary physician. Dr. Riccardi, on being inquired of as to the contents of the phial, would never express his opinion. Perhaps prudence was the cause of his silence; but his conduct indicated that there was something which *should not* be told.

"He lets his mother know," says Dr. Wiseman, "by a letter, that he has been poisoned; and she, who is everywhere spoken of as most affectionate, replies by exhorting him to patience! Will any mother believe this?"

There is very little reason to suppose, that if the social affections of the Italians were not invaded by the unhallowed influence of priest-

craft, any Italian mother would have given such an exhortation. But where this influence is absolute, as it is to a very great extent in Rome, over the devotees of the Catholic religion, the current of domestic love is interrupted; and all the conduct of life is viewed in connection with the will of the priesthood. Since the men who constitute this order are deemed, by the infatuated devotees of their system, to be impregnable to the assaults of ordinary temptation to vice, they are hardly suspected of it, when it is imputed to them. And it is not improbable that the exhortation to patience was given under the spell of this incredulity. English mothers, whose affection has never been vitiated by any such unnatural influence, may feel the whole force of Dr. Wiseman's pathetic appeal to this strongest passion of the female mind. But to estimate it rightly, it is necessary it should be regarded in its proper connection with that system which insinuates its withering influence into all the recesses of the human soul, which it penetrates with the keenest vigilance, that it may discover whether its emotions are in harmony or at variance with its imperious control. The unsophisticated mind revolts at the suggestion of *patience*, under the circumstances which are supposed; for it believes that the sway of natural feeling may be absolute. But the system of Romanism comes between human affection and its proper objects, and

controls the manifestation of those emotions to which genuine humanity always pays respect.

But notwithstanding all the adverse power of external influence, maternal love rises triumphantly, and determines the course of her conduct. And the expression of it was contained in the promise, that whatever was possible, should be done to obtain a dispensation of the vows which had been taken.

The necessary course for attaining this object having been some months afterwards recommended to me by my mother, Dr. Wiseman says respecting it, "His mother, who could have done the thing just as well or better at any previous time, now gets him to write a memorial," &c. How did *he* know that she could? He is sufficiently fluent in gratuitous assertion to merit an occasional contradiction. She had first to overcome all the reluctance of her husband, and then to set herself against all the determined opposition of her son, the priest; besides whatever other ecclesiastical influence might intervene between her benevolent intention and the execution of her purpose. Irrespectively of these obstacles, it was necessary to wait several months before such a degree of health and strength was restored as could enable me to endure the anxiety and exertion incident to this proceeding. These facts show that it was not a matter of discretion with her to choose an earlier time for this

object, since everything by which she could be actuated besides her own irrepressible affection for me, and my importunate applications, presented itself as an obstacle in her way. But why did she not visit me in the monastery and gain more particular information as to the ill usage I had received? All private intercourse had been forbidden, and she could not have seen me except in the presence of a master. (Nar. p. 62.) And if I had dared to utter a complaint in the presence of this witness, I had good reason to apprehend the consequences, of which I had received so ominous an intimation.

Dr. Wiseman affirms (p. 281), that he "has not found any one who heard of these transactions in Rome." His want of information in this respect, is not of the least value in the part which he has taken; for there are other things which it concerned him much more, as a Roman Catholic bishop, to know, with which, yet, he admits himself to be unacquainted. It merely shows that all the information relating to one subject is not necessarily incorporated in one individual.

Dr. Wiseman has constant recourse to *circumstances* with the hope of diverting the attention of readers from the *facts* to which they relate; but which he cannot impugn. All his sarcasm is therefore heaped together to throw obloquy upon a statement of facts; it is hardly needful to be said that this sarcasm

is disingenuously applied ; because that is the necessary consequence of its being substituted for literary criticism. And when he cannot make even the most sophistical attack upon circumstances, he endeavours to make me an object of derision. The following passage may illustrate the latter part of this observation.

“Here he is struggling single-handed against a powerful religious body, the superiors of which are now at his feet, most humbly gracious to him ; all Rome is ringing with his name ; all its great men, the saintly Del Bufalo, the pious Palotti, the eloquent Finetti, come to wrestle with the youthful champion, but in vain. Only one thing more is wanted—the notice and sympathies of royalty. These are soon procured. The good old dowager queen of Sardinia comes twice to the monastery, and is ‘informed of his mournful history ;’ of course by himself.” (pp. 281—2.)

The facts to which these remarks allude are mentioned in the Narrative, and are simply these ; after the memorial had been presented to the Congregation of bishops and regulars, and when efforts were made to induce the petitioner to withdraw it, the monks behaved towards him in a very different manner. There were obvious reasons for this, without any merit or importance in me being even supposed as the cause ; a conciliatory treatment might soften that resentment under the

influence of which the memorial had been presented, and second the efforts which their friends were making to induce me to abandon my cause against them ; or if they could not succeed in turning me from my purpose, such simulated kindness might be brought as evidence that the charges were unfounded. Nor is any thing of self-importance assumed in stating the fact that the distinguished men above mentioned used their influence to induce me to withdraw the statement of my wrongs. The credit of the order was affected by the facts related in the memorial ; and as there was danger that public scandal might be *fixed* upon it by steadily persisting in the course which had been commenced, it would be obviously best to quash the proceedings, by having the memorial withdrawn. And the outrages which had been complained of might then sink into oblivion. No disputation or discussion on matters of opinion was the object of the visits of these distinguished men. Their reputation and their influence, it was presumed, might give force to their advice and persuasion, which were exerted, it is believed, with exclusive regard to the reputation and interest of the monastery. No personal vanity, as Dr. Wiseman so freely insinuates, was therefore appealed to in these transactions. Nor, again, was there any thing of this kind in the casual visits to the monastery of the dowager queen of Sardinia ; nor was her

“sympathy” shown to the unfortunate object, of whose calamities she had been informed; for her regard was expressed in terms of pity, without an effort to obtain relief. Her palace was situated in the parish of San Bernardo, and some members of her family were in the habit of visiting the Cistercian monastery; and from these, and not from myself, she had learned whatever she knew of my history and circumstances. As there was nothing in these transactions to excite “the spirit of vanity,” so there was nothing in recording them, which gave it power over “the spirit of truth.” For Dr. Wiseman says, “Alas! that the spirit of vanity should have so prevailed over the spirit of truth.” Alas! I reply, that the character of any portion of general literature and criticism should be confided to such a man; and that the smallest current of public opinion should acknowledge so bitter a fountain as its source.

I come now to notice the sentence which the Congregation of bishops and regulars at last pronounced with respect to the petition for nullity of vows, and which Dr. Wiseman “unhesitatingly pronounces untrue.” It was, however, pronounced in the sense in which it is stated in the Narrative. The *sense* of that sentence, and the *condition* in which I should have been placed by submitting to it, are expressed in the Narrative (pp. 97—8). And this, I thought, was sufficient to

inform the English reader of the course of a transaction which took place in Rome. It is not pretended that the *words* of the sentence were those by which the purport of it is expressed in the Narrative. For as the procurator-general refused to allow the papers to be taken from the monastery, where they had been left on my leaving Rome, I was unable to give either “the original or a literal translation of it.” As a sentence of the court of Rome, the iniquitous cruelty of it consisted chiefly in its essential difference from those which are usually pronounced in cases of similar applications. The dispensation of the monastic vows had not been sought with the view to secularization, for in that case, the clause *servata tamen substantia votorum* would have been expected, and there would have been no ground for complaint. But as the entire nullity of the vows was sought, it had not been apprehended that arbitrary power would interfere with the usual course of judicial proceedings, and determine, by the expression of absolute will, a state which had not been decreed by ecclesiastical law. Such was, however, the character of the sentence—a release from the bond of monastic life, without the privilege of social freedom; whilst the restraint imposed by the limitation was calculated to confer no advantage, even according to the notions entertained in the Church of Rome; and served, therefore, no other end

than that of gratifying vindictive passion. The latter clause of the sentence in the Narrative,—“though a secular, he must remain a celibat, like the knights of Malta,”—was used merely to express the peculiarity of the condition which the sentence of the Congregation imposed.

“One must come,” says Dr. Wiseman (p. 283), “to a very satisfactory conclusion as to the good-nature and easy-heartedness of the monks. For immediately after this occurrence, they select him to the honour of holding a public disputation on philosophy; yes, the moment after he had publicly accused them to the cardinals and Pope of being poisoners, and of every other crime, and after they had retorted on him that he was a heretic, insolent to superiors, negligent in psalmody, &c. What a spell he must have had over them,—no, it is clear that the Cistercian body could not live without him, even though now, by the rescript above quoted, they could justly and rightly have ejected him and sent him home.” Ah! where did Dr. Wiseman learn that “they could *justly* and *rightly*,” or even *possibly*, have done as he affirms, by virtue of that sentence? At all events, they are not understood, in Rome, to be invested with such power. And the books which declare the law, in such cases, state the matter differently.

A simple statement of the case may, however be sufficient to show the fallacy of the

confident assertion just quoted. The sentence had been given in answer to a petition; and it assumed the character of a privilege. But that which is offered as a privilege may be either accepted or declined. The right of appealing against this sentence was admitted; and that admission allowed that the cause was still pending, or at least that it was not *absolutely* determined. For the sentence was not in the form of a verdict pronounced in determining a prosecution for an offence; and, therefore, it gave the monks no power to act. And, by the by, this may tend further to indicate the simplicity of confidence with which Dr. Wiseman's positive assurances may be entertained; or, at least, it may suggest to the reader the relation which they bear to truth. As to my having been selected to hold a public disputation on philosophy, it was one of the various means employed to divert my attention from the cause in which I was still engaged against the monks. It was not that they “could not live without” me, but the concealment of their own disreputable conduct was the object on which they were so earnestly intent. And the conferring of any honour, as well as the granting of any favour, might be alleged to discredit the charges which had been preferred against them, even if it could not soften the resentment, and aid in obtaining a retraction of those charges.

I now come to notice that part of the

article in which a doubt is thrown over the facts, stated in the Narrative of my temporary residence in the house of S. Eusebio; and in respect of which Dr. Wiseman says, "We do not believe a syllable of it. We know that house, we know those men too well, not to feel assured that there can be no truth in it."

Perhaps this really expresses the honest conviction of his mind. Many others have *felt* assured that they were right, without any evidence to support their confidence besides that of their own imagination. And since what a man *wishes* to be the truth, he often finds a facility in persuading himself is a reality, it needs not excite much surprise that it should be so in this instance. It is not for Dr. Wiseman's information that his conclusion is declared to be wrong. *He* may not be interested in knowing it. But if he has been so transcendently elevated by the honour of episcopal dignity, that it does not concern him to know what is truth, there are others with whom that circumstance does not diminish its value. It much concerns the English to know what is the state of Catholicism in Rome; and what are the tender mercies of the Holy(?) Office. For what it is in Rome, it is by virtue of its necessary principles having no adverse influence from the presence of any benign system, to soften the malignity of its despotism over the human mind.

I had been sent to that house, in conse-

quence of having avowed opinions which were deemed heretical. And the object appeared to be to reduce me to a penitential submission, and a retractation of my reputed errors. I was, therefore, obliged to listen to tedious discourses on transubstantiation, confession, purgatory, relics, the adoration of images, indulgences, and other subjects. At length a form of recantation was proposed, but to which I refused to subscribe. And the anger which was evinced by the Jesuit who had been sent to propose it, renewed all those apprehensions of suffering which are deemed the suitable reward of disobedience to the Church. The fears,—“the gloomy shapes of imagination,”—by which I was then constantly haunted, and the circumspection of which those fears suggested the propriety, were expressed in the following passage. “I now momentarily expected to be conducted to the torture. Whenever I was taken from my room to the chapel, I feared lest some trap-door* should open beneath my feet; and,

* The horror produced in the mind, at the apprehension of falling through a trap-door, may be estimated by the English reader, when he is informed, that, in a place beneath this door, there is an arrangement of a number of swords, or some similar weapons, fixed with their points upwards, which must inevitably receive the victim who should tread upon the fatal spot. It is hardly needful to intimate, that death is the certain consequence of such a fall. A trap-door

therefore, took great care to tread in the footsteps of the Jesuit who preceded me. No one acquainted with the Inquisition will say that my precaution was needless. My imagination was so filled with the horrors of this place, that, even in my short interrupted and feverish dreams I beheld daggers and axes glittering around me; I heard the noise of the wheels, saw burning piles and heated irons, and woke in convulsive terror, only to give myself up to gloomy reflections, inspired by the reality of my situation, and the impressions left by these nocturnal visions." To this Dr. Wiseman adds, "Very fine, Mr. Ciocchi, but not true! and you know it too! No, no, the truth will come out. You know that you were no more in the Inquisition at S. Eusebio than you were in your own convent. You know that the *Holy Office* is by the colonnade of St. Peter's, and that S. Eusebio is two miles off beyond Sta. Maria Maggiore." Truly this is creating a phantom for the sake of having something to attack! What extraordinary criticism is this? Surely Dr. Wiseman must have been the only person who could understand the preceding passage to relate to anything which occurred at the

is not, necessarily, a permanent arrangement in any place; the weapons may be unscrewed, and every appearance of such an arrangement be removed in a very short time.

Inquisition; whilst the plain statement informed the reader, that these fears were excited during a temporary confinement in the house of S. Eusebio.

The offence for which I was confined in that house was virtually the same as that of which the Holy Office takes cognisance,—the holding of opinions which are deemed heretical: it differed only in degree. And here it may be necessary to apprise the Protestant reader of a distinction which the Church of Rome makes between *material* and *formal* heresy. The first is fundamental error, which is fallen into through ignorance. If, then, proper means of instruction be used, and the person entertaining the error refuse to acknowledge it to be such, and to retract, the heresy becomes *formal*; and the Inquisition takes cognisance of it. Hence, if the retractation had not been signed after the course of instruction under the Jesuits at S. Eusebio, there is little reason to doubt that they would have pronounced the heresy to be formal; and that instead of having been sent back to San Bernardo, I should have been forthwith conveyed to the Holy Office.*

* "How those are to be punished who differ in any degree from the verity of the orthodox faith."

Par. 3. "Of the punishment of the obstinate."

"But if any one shall fall into such madness as not to fear to defend his heresy pertinaciously and obstinately, let him be altogether deprived of his religious

Then follows a challenge by way of putting me "to the test;" and it is confidently predicted that, under the severe scrutiny of this

habit, and delivered over to the power of the lords inquisitors, and subjected to a trial; that they who rightly know what is just and merciful may see what is further to be done. But if any one shall be formally convicted of heresy, and shall have taught his heresies either publicly or privately, and, returning to himself, shall have abjured all his heresy, and sought for mercy, besides the penalties of the sacred canons, we will that he should be for ever deprived of the administration of any sacraments; and shall never be permitted either publicly or privately to exercise the office either of reading or preaching. Let him understand that he shall be deprived of all his degrees, honours, and dignities, without any hope of restitution; and let him be, and be esteemed, *de facto*, the lowest of his order."

Par. 2. "Two assessors to be called."

"First let him take with him, in causes and cases of this kind, two of his assistants (*socios*), as assessors and counsel, professors either of sacred theology, or of pontifical law, or doctors; upon whose advice and judgment he shall conduct and conclude the matter, whom he shall expressly name in his sentence, whether of acquittal or of condemnation; and shall cause them to subscribe it. He must, however, before acquittal, notify to the Holy Office, and preserve all the proceedings; and after the acquittal send the public instruments of the sentences and abjurations to the Holy Office.

"Let him punish those who confess or are convicted by a condign penalty, according to the appointment of the holy canons and œcumenical councils. He may, however, with the approbation of the said assessors, after a time, mitigate and commute a perpetual or a very long imprisonment," &c.—Tom. iii. *Lucæ Holstenii*, *Codex Reg. Monas. et Canonic.* cap. x.

test, the Narrative "will break down." "Hear, then," says Dr. Wiseman, "our proposal. There are plenty of English gentlemen going to Rome this winter; there are many there already. Choose any one that you please, and we will pledge ourselves that he shall be permitted to search the house from garret to cellar, and measure the thickness of the walls, aided by an architect; and see whether there be even a possibility of trap-doors, &c." What

When the penalty of excommunication is pronounced, "the excommunicated person is given up to the devil."

"The first (rule) is what here St. Benedict derives from the authority of the apostle, namely, that the excommunicated person is given over to the power of Satan. For as the Church remits convicted heretics to the secular power, so she delivers excommunicated persons to the power of Satan.

"St. Augustine says, Every Christian who is excommunicated by the priests is given over to Satan. How? Because the devil is outside the Church as Christ is within. And in this manner he who is removed from the communion of the Church is, as it were, given over to the devil. Clearly, a man being deprived of the prayers of the Church, there is no doubt that a greater power against him is given to the devil to torment him spiritually, and even bodily. Whence, in the primitive Church, whenever it was necessary to invite men by signs to faith (as the Holy Spirit was manifested by signs), excommunication was made known by the bodily assaults of the devil.

"The second reason is, because excommunication is a stroke of the spiritual sword, more to be dreaded than that of a material one."—Reg. S. Bened.; *De Gravioribus Culpis*, &c. In capitulo xxv. Tract. lxxxiv

motive, on earth, could have dictated this challenge, except it was to *assert* to the English nation that the author of it had great influence at Rome? *Only a declaration*, which, it has been sufficiently shown, is not always the guarantee of certainty, is given, that free access should be granted to inspect most minutely the house of S. Eusebio. Would not the Jesuits deem the application an impertinence? But it is not necessary. I was in the condition of a *prisoner* in that house, not knowing what punishment I might have to undergo; there is nothing, therefore, outrageous in the idea of fear having been excited in a strange place, even if that fear was not justified by any thing obvious in its appearance.

But what other person would ever have thought of "measuring the thickness of the walls" to "see whether there was even a possibility of trap-doors" opening beneath one's feet? Of course no one but "*an architect*" would be competent to such an undertaking; and even he, it is presumed, must be furnished with some new principles of geometry, to determine from "*the thickness of the walls*" that there is not "even a possibility of trap-doors" opening *in the floor*. The ideas are so badly put together, that the medley is perfectly ludicrous. Is it possible to conceive the idea of any intelligent Englishman undertaking the inquiry? He would render himself

still more the object of ridicule than the author of the proposal; inasmuch as he would take a vast deal of trouble to determine a possibility or an impossibility, from premises which have no relation to the consequence.

One very grave charge yet remains to be met, since it is represented as affecting generally the veracity of the Narrative. It is founded upon a discrepancy in the dates, owing either to a mistranslation, or to a typographical error, that was overlooked in correcting the press. It may be necessary to quote the following passages for the purpose of making the explanation clear.

"He goes into the library, after some absence, on *Easter Monday*. He fixes his departure for *Thursday*. That same *Monday* he goes to Santa Croce to see his friends. As he returned home, he thought he would return by the Church of *St. Gregory*, 'at that time gorgeously decorated for the solemnization of *the festival of the saint*.' The Pope was there, as he generally is on St. Gregory's day, he having been a monk of that house. On *Tuesday*, he visits his family; on *Wednesday*, he took leave of the monks, &c. That evening, as far as we can gather, he went to the house of his friend, and put on his disguise of a servant. He started from Rome, *we must suppose*, next day, and was two days on his journey to Civita-Vecchia (though certainly

the usual time is one). He remains four days at Civita-Vecchia, and embarks for Leghorn. His flight from Rome, we are told, took place on the *thirteenth of March*.

“Now let us put these dates together.

“Easter Monday, in 1842, fell on *March the twenty-eighth*.

“The Thursday following, was consequently the *thirty-first*.

“Yet Ciocchi visited the library on *Easter Monday*, and left the following *Thursday*, and that was the thirteenth.

“Again, St. Gregory’s day is the *twelfth* of March, and in that year fell on Saturday, before Passion Sunday, and was kept on that day. Yet Ciocchi, on *Monday the twenty-eighth*, went to the Church of St. Gregory for his festival!”—See pp. 285—6.

The error which it is said was overlooked, was that of putting *thirteenth* for *thirtieth*,*

* I have not at present by me the means of determining whether the error was committed by the translator, or by the printer; but on referring to the original manuscript, from which the translation was made, it is certain it must have been by one of them, the words having been “*Se invece di avventurare la fuga il giorno trenta di Marzo, io fossi partito il giorno sei Aprile.*” In proof of this statement, I have much pleasure in adding the following testimony with which I have been favoured:—

“I hereby certify that I have seen the original Italian manuscript of Mr. Ciocchi’s Narrative, and that it has the date of his flight from Rome the 30th of March, not the 13th, as stated in the translation. This

the day of quitting Rome for Civita-Vecchia; this was not on *Thursday the thirty-first*, the day to which Dr. Wiseman assigns this event. The time occupied in the journey was the remainder of Wednesday, and the greater part of Thursday; the distance being nearly forty miles.

The visit to St. Gregory’s church took place on Easter Monday, and not on the feast day of that saint, as Dr. Wiseman has erroneously affirmed. It is true the church had been decorated for the festival of the saint. But it is customary at Rome, when such preparations are made a short time before a great general festival of the Church, to let the decorations remain till after the second festival has been kept. And it was in accordance with this usage, that the ornaments of St. Gregory’s Church were allowed to remain till after Easter. Dr. Wiseman ought to have known, and surely he *must* have known, of this

accounts for the apparent discrepancy so much dwelt upon by Dr. Wiseman, and vindicates the credit of his important little work.

“I have great pleasure in adding, that from several months’ personal knowledge of Mr. Ciocchi, I believe him to be entirely worthy of credence; and trust he is one of those of whom the Lord says, ‘Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.’

“May the same Divine mercy reach his now malicious accuser.

“29, *Hamilton-square*,
“*April 28, 1845.*”

“JOSEPH BAYLEE,
Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Birkenhead.”

usage. But an assumed necessity for fixing the visit to the church, to St. Gregory's day, gave a colour to his charge of chronological inaccuracy. But does not the Pope visit that church on any other occasion than on the festival of that saint? If Dr. Wiseman could show that he does not, then indeed, his observation would be worth something to his cause. This explanation appears to be all that was required to show that there was no *original* inconsistency in this part of the Narrative, of which it was triumphantly said, "*Some of these statements must be false.*"

"We have reserved," says Dr. Wiseman, "one other clear one (untruth), for the conclusion, though it will take us back to the early period of his life. He tells us that after he had been five years with the Redemptorists, he 'was sent to the College of the Jesuits in Rome.' After four years he writes to his mother, expressing his firm determination to stay no longer at College, and his ardent desire to return to the bosom of his family, and, *living at home*, to frequent the schools of the Sapienza. Now we would fain ask *what* College was he in? For all this supposes his being an inmate of *some* establishment. Yet the Jesuits *have no such College* at Rome, except the Noble College, to which there is no appearance of Ciocchi's having been admitted. The Collegio Romano, the schools of which he may have frequented,

has no boarders, and admits only day scholars, as the Sapienza does. We must therefore conclude, that even in so simple a matter as his place of education, Ciocchi cannot tell us the simple truth."

In this passage, Dr. Wiseman has arrived at a *conclusion* from a *mere supposition*. But as his supposition is *false*, so is his conclusion. First, there is a little piece of artifice to be noticed, which is shown in the use of these words, "and, living at home;" for they were not found in the Narrative. The passage in the Narrative is this. "I disclosed to her my firm resolution of no longer remaining in this College, and my ardent wish to return to the bosom of my family. I represented to her that the gratification of this desire would prove no obstacle to the pursuit of my studies, as I could continue them in the schools of the Sapienza." The introduction of those words, in speaking of this letter, makes it appear that I was not then living at home; but all the students of the Roman College (and it is obvious, page 11, that I meant to describe myself as one of them), *do* live at home; whilst the rigid discipline to which they are subject, deprives them of the freedom and joy of social intercourse. A short explanation of the austerity under which they are placed, may be sufficient to show that though they live at home, they do not live "in the bosom of their family."

In the summer, at break of day, and in the winter, an hour later, a servant goes into the student's room and wakes him. He then rises, and prepares for the duties of school. His breakfast is now taken to him. The "pedante" (schoolmaster), who is an abbot employed by the Jesuits to assemble their pupils, calls to conduct him to school, collecting all the pupils that live in the same neighbourhood. After the students have gone through the duties of school, and have attended mass, this person accompanies them to their respective homes. As soon as the youth has taken his dinner, he is obliged to retire to his room to prepare for the duties of the school in the afternoon. The "pedante" then returns and accompanies him to school, and afterwards in a walk : he also conducts him home at the close of the day. He is allowed to take his other meal with the family ; and the evening is spent in the retired prosecution of study ; and the "pedante" calls to hear the lessons for the next day recited. And as he is required to rise early, so he retires early to rest. Those parents who pay great deference to the injunctions of the priests, are very strict in requiring of their sons a scrupulous observance of all that their tutors demand of them. Thus, although they live at home, the only time they are allowed to spend with the family is the brief space occupied in taking

two meals in each day. But it is obvious that this does not afford opportunity for the cheerfulness of social intercourse ; and the "wish to return to the bosom of my family" (page 16), meant no more than the privilege of living at home, without the unnatural restraints which the Jesuits imposed.

But why was a *letter* written to express this wish ? It was that the wish and the determination might be conveyed in becoming terms of affection, in a tone both temperate and decided, without the fear of being thwarted by any remonstrance which might excite a disrespectful warmth of feeling, or any conduct inconsistent with filial duty. Where is now this "clear untruth" that was *reserved* with so much importance "for the conclusion ?"—and where are the premises for this *conclusion*, "that even in so simple a matter as his place of education, Ciocchi cannot tell the simple truth ?" But the rules to which it is said (page 9), the students attending this establishment were required to conform, were, obviously, not such as would be proposed to those who were entering a College in which they should reside, and where they would be constantly under the eye of the masters. It was therefore a *strained misconstruction* of the statement in the Narrative, to make it appear untrue, rather than a "clear untruth," which might be easily detected.

We approach now the close of this article, and find the following very strong objection. "Even after most of this article was in type and the first portion of it printed, we have been able to examine another of Ciocci's statements, and find it false. The name of the arch-plotter in dispersing the young university troop, and in kidnapping Ciocci, Father Braudi, sounded to us new. We have, therefore, searched through the printed catalogues of the Roman province of the Society of Jesus, for the years 1836, 1837, and 1838, in which every member's name is given. The result is, *that no such Jesuit as Father Braudi is found in any of them at Rome or elsewhere*; and, as we firmly believe, no such person was in existence. This is enough to throw discredit on *that* tale, and, in fact, on the whole book."

This man, whose existence is gravely doubted, certainly does not belong to the *Roman province*; he is a Piedmontese. I never saw his name in writing or in print; but from the common pronunciation of it in my family, I supposed it was spelt *Braudi*. I once heard the name mentioned by the Procurator-General of the monastery, D. Girolamo Bottini, who pronounced it *Braida*. It is not improbable, that this may be the true orthography of his name. At all events the termination is very usual in proper names in that province; and it is likely that the

pronunciation which was commonly heard was a corruption of it,—by changing the sound, in accordance with the very common termination of Italian names.

In 1831, when considerable uneasiness was felt at Rome, lest established institutions and public tranquillity should be interrupted by any attempt at a revolution, the most sagacious Jesuits were called from all parts of Italy, and placed in those situations in Rome in which it appeared they would be most likely to accomplish the purpose, whatever it was, for which they had been assembled. This was one of the Jesuits who then made their appearance at Rome. And as they had been selected for their superior ability, and insinuating address, so they were soon able to exert a considerable influence in society. This was found to be useful; and they therefore continued to occupy their positions of influence. Hence the name of *Father Braudi* or *Braida*, would not, of course, appear in the "printed catalogues of the Roman province of the Society of Jesus." There are many other Jesuits in Rome who do not, any more than this man, belong to the Roman province, and whose names would not therefore be entitled to a place in those catalogues; but it would be an erroneous application of logic to conclude that *therefore* they were not "in existence."

In conclusion, we see how sophistry, when

it flows in a current of witty sarcasm, can be plausibly substituted for genuine criticism; we see, further, how even a learned man can associate the most egregious folly with the most inflated pomp, and that zeal for a cause could, for a time, outweigh all discretion; and we see that neither respect for truth, nor any other principle, was of any force in comparison with the desire of destroying the credibility of my Narrative. Certainly, if truth would have accomplished that object, his efforts might have been wisely employed in doing so. But the public will judge whether this has been done, even by the beguiling influence of wit, and whatever else could be introduced in the place of truth and legitimate criticism.

It was inevitable, in relating a case of individual persecution in Italy, not to expose, in a *general way*, some of the dark transactions of the Church of Rome; because all those devices which she employs to give a peculiar cruelty to the bitter cup of persecution, have arisen out of the perverted use of that power which she has attained by enslaving intelligence in moral degradation, by absorbing all the vitality of freedom, and by extending her leaden sceptre over benighted consciences, which she forbids to refer to Holy Scripture as a guide.

Such an exposure would necessarily provoke the anger of those whose respectability

and authority and power are identified with the usurpation of the "Man of Sin." Let it not, therefore, be thought extraordinary, that so much earnestness should have been shown, to give the appearance of falsehood to the charges contained in the Narrative. But though truth may seem to slumber for a while; aye, she may be thrown into a dungeon, and appear like Samson in the hands of his enemies; yet shall the defeat of all who persist in their enmity to her holy sway be as complete as theirs was; whilst she, unlike the captive Israelite, shall survive all the machinations of her foes, and hold a majestic and triumphant sway over minds, enlightened and purified by her influence, which shall yield a willing homage to all her high behests. The era of the liberty of Divine truth has long been ushered in; and indications have been given, by her great progress within the present century, of the approach of that day of which the prospect raised to the highest strains the joy of prophetic anticipations; and of which the Christian Church has received the most sacred assurance that it shall all be fully accomplished. That day of light will show the error of misused authority which forbade the poor man to read his Bible; and will point to that book as the great means of annihilating that authority which could not endure its light; whilst it shall acquire honour from the plainness of its

own declarations, which foretold, before the rise of that power, its existence and its destruction.

The first case of imputed insanity referred to in p. 56, is that of a Franciscan father, of the Convent of the Holy Apostles, in Rome, a man of superior abilities; but who, for having ventured to oppose the will of the superior of his order, was declared to be insane, and was shut up in the madhouse, in Via Longara, where he has been confined many years. He amuses himself by describing his misfortune in good Latin verses, on scraps of paper, which he throws out at the window, to persons passing by. Father Clari, a member of the same order, assured me that this man had been sent to the madhouse, by an exercise of power in the superior, whom he had offended by asserting his rights in opposition to authority.

The second case, is that of D. Francisco De Nardis, a young priest of great talent of the episcopal city of Penna, in Abruzzo, who is confined in the great madhouse at Aversa, in the kingdom of Naples. On the 24th of June, 1840, he was celebrating mass in the convent of Santa Chiara, of the Dominican nuns; and when he came to the elevation of the Host, the people struck their hands upon their breasts. On witnessing this, he addressed to them these words: "Be not deceived; for,

after all, what you see is only a piece of bread." He was prevented from saying more, for the other priests who were present immediately conducted him into the vestry. The occurrence was immediately made known to the Bishop D. Domenico Ricciardoni, a learned theologian, who sent for the young priest and argued with him. And when De Nardis had replied to the Bishop, he added, "but do *you* believe it, Monsignor?" and received this reply, "I did believe that you understood something; but I find you do not." The most learned canons and other influential men of the city united their efforts to induce him to retract; but finding that he remained firm in the persuasion that what he had said was true, the professor of the episcopal seminary, under whom he had studied theology, was called. A long discussion took place between the professor and his former pupil; and it was concluded by the latter, in the following address; "Sir, you have put into my hands the Scriptures, of which in the school of theology I could obtain no knowledge, except by the few texts which are disguised in the treatises of Dommatica. The Holy Scriptures have enlightened me on this point. If I am wrong, it is you that have led me into error. But I hope that in reading the Bible you also will find the same thing. I am sure that I shall suffer for the step which I have taken; but I am persuaded it is the duty of all who know

the truth, to declare it, at all hazards. And if every one did this, the people would not remain in ignorance." The Bishop reported the case at Naples ; and the priest was declared to be mad, and his opinions atheistical. But all the seculars, and many of the priests who conversed with him, affirmed that his conversation was perfectly rational ; and that whether the topic was important or indifferent he would discourse on it, without betraying the least indication of insanity, or ever reverting from it to the particular notions by which he had made himself conspicuous. He was, however, committed, first to the criminal prison of Teramo, where he remained a few days, and was then sent to the madhouse in Aversa for perpetual confinement.

He had not been long there before an order of the minister of police, in connection with those of religion, was issued for the arrest of the professor. But being aware of his danger, he escaped to England. He is now in this country ; and has experienced the force of that truth for which his pupil suffers.